



Library of

Wellesley



College.

Purchased from

no 62392 Sweet Fund.



THE EXPOSITOR
VOL. IV.

List of Contributors to Volume IV.

- REV. PROFESSOR B. W. BACON, D.D., LL.D.
REV. THOMAS BARNS, M.A.
REV. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.
F. C. CONYBEARE, M.A.
S. A. COOK, M.A.
LATE PROFESSOR ERNST CURTIUS.
REV. PROFESSOR ADOLF DEISSMANN, D.D., D.THEOL.
REV. PROFESSOR JAMES DENNEY, D.D.
REV. PRINCIPAL A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.
REV. F. LL. GRIFFITH, M.A.
REV. F. R. M. HITCHCOCK, M.A., B.D.
REV. W. W. HOLDSWORTH.
REV. PRINCIPAL JAMES IVERACH, D.D.
REV. DANIEL M. M'INTYRE, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR H. R. MACKINTOSH, M.A., PHIL.D.
REV. PROFESSOR R. MACKINTOSH, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A., LITT.D.
REV. NEWTON H. MARSHALL, M.A., PHIL.D.
REV. J. H. MICHAEL, B.A.
REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR J. H. MOULTON, D.D.
W. B. NEATBY, M.A.
REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, M.A., B.D.
PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., D.D.
REV. G. S. STREATFEILD, M.A.
REV. G. R. WYNNE, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR THEODOR ZAHN, LITT.D.

THE
EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

SEVENTH SERIES

Volume IV

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C

MCMVII

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

62392

62
W
F
N

THE RISEN LORD.

(1) "THE New Testament itself," says Harnack, "distinguishes the Easter-message of the empty grave and the appearances of Jesus on the one hand and the Easter-faith on the other. Although it gives the highest value to that message, it demands the Easter faith even without it. . . ." "The *Easter-message* reports the wonderful occurrence in the garden of Joseph of Arimathaea, which, however, no eye saw, the empty grave, into which several women and disciples looked, the appearances of the Lord in glorified form—so glorified that His own could not at once recognize Him,—soon also speeches and deeds of the Risen One; always more complete and more confident do the reports become. But the *Easter-faith* is the conviction of the victory of the Crucified over death, of the power and the righteousness of God, and of the life of Him, who is the firstborn among many brethren. . . ." "But who among us can affirm that it is possible from the narratives of Paul and the Gospels to form a distinct picture of these appearances; and, if that is impossible, and no tradition of single occurrences is absolutely certain, how does one want to base the Easter-faith upon them? . . ." "Whatever may have happened at the grave and in the appearances, one thing stands sure: from this grave the indestructible faith in the conquest of death and in an eternal life had its origin." (*Das Wesen des Christentums*, pp. 101-102.) This distinction is an instance of Harnack's endeavour to preserve what is essential to Christian faith, and yet to

sacrifice whatever is supernatural (at least in the physical realm) in the Christian history. But the validity of the distinction must be challenged, as well as the grounds given for it. The words to Thomas, "Blessed are they that have not seen and yet believed," are surely a rebuke to him for distrusting the testimony of his fellow-disciples (John xx. 29). The reproach to the two on the way to Emmaus is directed against their hesitation to believe the tidings brought by the women, confirmed as these were by the prophetic interpretations of the Messiah's entrance through His passion into His glory (Luke xxiv. 25-26). It is exceedingly doubtful whether Paul would have ever reached the conviction that the Lord is the Spirit, and consequently the certainty of the Resurrection, or the conception of Christ as "the second Adam" from heaven, or the experience of God's revelation of His Son as living on the way to Damascus had he not received the testimony of the Church regarding Christ's appearances, and had not his unbelief been changed to faith by a vision of the Risen Christ, which he reckons among, and as similar to these appearances. The stress Paul lays on the appearances as evidence of the resurrection of Christ (1 Cor. xv. 5-8) altogether forbids the attempt to detach his *Easter-faith*, or that of the Christian Church, with which in these matters he knew himself to be in agreement, from the *Easter-message*. For us with the evidences of Christ's presence and power in His church throughout many generations belief in the Risen Lord may not depend so exclusively on the historical testimony, but so comfortless and hopeless was the condition of the disciples after the Crucifixion, that it is certain the *Easter-faith* would not have arisen within them had not the *Easter-message* come to them. If the testimony of the early Church is to be distrusted in so important a matter, if it could imagine such appear-

ances, and base its faith in the Risen Lord on these, if it could not distinguish the real grounds of its convictions from these fictitious ones, do we not discredit its intelligence and discernment? Can a true faith rest on false imaginations? If the conviction that *Christ lives* is one that we to-day may retain, as Harnack himself maintains, does it not carry with it consequences which he ignores? The physical is subordinate to the spiritual. If Christ as living Spirit did conquer death really, why should not the physical consequences of death be so far annulled that it was possible for Him to give His disciples such sensible evidence as was necessary to give them the certainty of that conquest? The system of nature as we know it gives us no knowledge of the possibilities of life beyond death; and, therefore, our common experience does not, and cannot set the limits to what might or might not be possible, physically, for one who had so conquered death spiritually that He could be a spiritual presence and power to men on this side of the grave. If Harnack concedes so much, he may concede more with logical consistency. May we not in our argument go beyond the possibility and recognize the probability of such manifestations of the subordination of the physical to the spiritual? Death as physical is a reality to men, which they dread, from which they shrink. Would the conquest of death be adequate, which did not include the captivity even of the physical phenomenon? Is the redemption complete, which does not include the transformation of the body of humiliation?

(2) Harnack lays stress on the fact that the records of the appearances do not allow us to form a distinct picture, and that the tradition of no single occurrence is absolutely certain. Reserving for the moment the question of the evidence, the indistinctness of the presentation may be explained by two reasons, *subjective* and *objective*. That

so many persons of different temperament and varied intelligence should be deceived by hallucinations of sight and sound is incredible ; but it is quite probable that their surprise and bewilderment made them less capable of exact observation and accurate recollection, than if they had been witnessing such an event as came within their common experience. That manifestations from the other side of the grave, communications from the unseen in the seen, should be subject to other laws than physical phenomena is not improbable. Both as regards the objective realities and as regards the subjective impression of them we cannot expect the same distinctness of presentation as in regard to the ordinary events of human history. With this concession, can we claim that the evidence is sufficient to justify belief in the *Easter-message* as well as acceptance of the *Easter-faith* ? “ A fact so stupendous as the Resurrection,” says Dr. Sanday, “ needs to be supported by strong evidence, and very strong evidence both as regards quantity and quality is forthcoming ; but all parts of it are not of equal value, and it is well that the authorities should be compared with each other and critically estimated.” (*Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 170.) Although it is not the purpose of this series of *Studies* to deal with these apologetic questions, it does seem necessary to justify the discussion of the utterances of the Risen Lord as revealing the “ inner life ” by briefly sketching the argument for the credibility of the fact of the Resurrection as it is presented by Dr. Sanday, than whom it would be difficult to find a scholar both more candid and more cautious. The concluding verses of St. Mark must be left out of account, as the passage (verses 9-20) is not part of the original Gospel, and the passage (verses 1-8) is a fragment, and contains no appearance of the Risen Lord Himself. The discovery of the empty tomb and the message of the angel here narrated are also

recorded by Matthew and Luke. Luke mentions as one of the women at the tomb *Joanna* (xxiv. 10), whom elsewhere he describes as "the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward" (viii. 3). He shows special knowledge of Herod's court (xxiii. 7-12), and of this Joanna was probably the channel. Through her, too, he may have received independent testimony regarding the Resurrection. The name Cleopas (=Cleopatros, xxiv. 18) suggests that the two disciples to whom Jesus appeared on the way to Emmaus also belonged to the Herodian circle, and the report of their experience, too, may have come to Luke through Joanna. Luke's casual reference to the appearance to Peter (ver. 34) is confirmed by Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5). Luke's narrative has links not with Mark and Paul only, but also with John, for the appearance to the Eleven in the Upper Room is recorded in both Gospels (Luke xxiv. 36 ff., John xx. 19 ff.), and it is confirmed by Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5). The manifestation to Thomas (John xx. 24 ff.) is recorded only in the Fourth Gospel, but it is not incredible as a "concrete illustration of the disbelief on which so many of our authorities lay stress." Although the appearance to the eleven disciples on a mountain in Galilee is recorded by Matthew alone (xxviii. 16 ff.), yet the history of the early Church does confirm the probability that the missionary commission was given by Jesus Himself. Yet Paul is our primary witness for the appearances of Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 5-8), "to Peter, to the Twelve, to an assembly of more than five hundred, to James, to all the Apostles." Paul's silence regarding the appearance to Mary Magdalene (John xx. 11-18) and to the two on the way to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 13 ff.) may be due to one of two reasons, that the stories had not reached him, or that he purposely confined himself to the mention of those who were commissioned to be witnesses of the Resurrection. He enumerates without describing the appearances, because

he is simply reminding the Corinthians of what he had been teaching them from the very beginning of his ministry among them (51 or 53 A.D.). In his earliest extant writing (1 Thess.) he refers twice to the fact of the Resurrection (i. 10 ; iv. 14) as common knowledge in the Church. Although the book of Acts is of later date, yet it represents the Apostles as from the very beginning the witnesses of the Resurrection (i. 8, 22). Paul does not seek to prove the fact ; he assumes that belief is common to himself and his opponents, and on this bases his argument to meet doubts about the resurrection of Christians (1 Cor. xv. 12 ; Compare 2 Tim. ii. 18 f.). Dr. Sanday recognizes that when we try to harmonize the records, " whichever way we turn, difficulties meet us, which the documents to which we have access do not enable us to remove " ; and yet he maintains that " no difficulty of weaving the separate incidents into an orderly well-compacted narrative can impugn the unanimous belief of the Church which lies behind them, that the Lord Jesus Christ rose from the dead on the third day, and appeared to the disciples " (*op. cit.* p. 180).

(3) Without entering into a critical examination of the narratives the difficulties alluded to by Dr. Sanday may be briefly mentioned. Matthew records an appearance of Jesus at the tomb to the women, in which is repeated the command to the disciples to go and meet Him in Galilee (xxviii. 10), and then reports the meeting on a mountain in Galilee (16-20). In the genuine fragment of Mark the angel at the tomb gives the same command (xvi. 6-7). Luke repeats not only the appearance to the women at the tomb, but also to the two on the way to Emmaus, to Peter, to the Eleven, all at or near Jerusalem. He represents Jesus at the appearance to the Eleven as enjoining them to remain in Jerusalem until they " were clothed with

power from on high " (xxiv. 49). He thus appears expressly to exclude any departure to Galilee. Then in the *Gospel* without indicating any lapse of time, as he does in *Acts* (i. 3), he records the Ascension (50-53). All the appearances mentioned in the Fourth Gospel, except that in the Appendix (chapter xxi.), are placed in Jerusalem, and the author indicates that the disciples remained at least a week in Jerusalem after the Resurrection (xx. 26). The critics usually prefer the tradition in Mark and Matthew "with or without the supposition that the grave was really found empty." Loofs has recently argued for the Luke and John tradition; but treats the story in John xxi. as partly misplaced (the fishing scene—Luke v. 1-11) and as partly disconnected with Galilee (the dialogue of verses 15-23). If we try to combine the two traditions, allowing for some time spent in Jerusalem (John xx. 26) by the disciples (in spite of the Lord's commands to go to Galilee, Matt. xxviii. 10) at the beginning of the period of forty days (*Acts* i. 3), and allowing for some time of waiting in Jerusalem at the end of the time according to Christ's injunctions (Luke xxiv. 49), the interval is scarcely long enough for the events in Galilee which must be placed in it, especially for the return of the disciples to their usual calling. It must be conceded then that the combination of the two traditions does involve serious difficulties; especially is the command of the Risen Lord, recorded in Matthew, that the disciples should go and meet Him in Galilee in apparent contradiction to John's and Luke's report of their continuance in Jerusalem, and the injunction of Jesus, according to Luke, that they should remain there till they received power. A less difficulty is Luke's report in the Gospel of the Ascension without the mention of any interval of time, and his correction of that report in the *Acts* by the definite statement "by the space of forty days." For this reason

no attempt will be made in this *Study* to fix definitely the order of events. Its purpose will be quite adequately served by considering some of the utterances ascribed to the Risen Lord as indicating the distinctive features of His "inner life" in the new mode of His existence. While the authenticity of these utterances is assumed, the possibility is recognized that in some degree the report may be coloured by the experience of the Christian Church of the truth and grace of the living Christ.

(4) These utterances suggest a contrast to, as well as a continuity with, the former earthly life, and seem even to offer some indications of a transition from the one to the other state. The outward appearance and the physical conditions were changed. Mary did not at once recognize her Master (John xx. 15); the eyes of the two on the way to Emmaus "were holden that they should not know Him" (Luke xxiv. 16, an explanation by the Evangelist of the failure to recognize which is unnecessary); the Eleven "were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit" (ver. 37); at the Sea of Galilee, when Jesus stood on the beach, the disciples knew Him not (John xxi. 4). It is implied in Matthew xxviii. 2 that the Lord had risen before the stone was rolled away from the sepulchre to display the empty grave. Closed doors could not prevent His presence (John xx. 19). Distance did not delay His movements. Before the two disciples, whom He had accompanied to Emmaus, got back to Jerusalem, He had appeared to Peter (Luke xxiv. 31, 34). The request for food seems to indicate similar physical conditions; but it was made to prove to the disciples that they were not seeing a ghost (Luke xxiv. 41-43; cf. Acts x. 41). "This," says E. R. Bernard, "with a view to the persons dealt with, could best be done by taking food. If there be resurrection of the body, there is no reason why such a body

should not have the power of taking food without depending on it. Once cross the boundary of the present sphere of existence, and we are in a realm where we can no longer say 'this is impossible.' Indeed it was the reality and identity of His risen body which the Lord had to insist on; the difference was evident, and spoke for itself." (Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, iv. 234.) The assurance to the disciples—"See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having" (Luke xxiv. 39)—cannot be pressed into the service of any conjecture about the anatomy of the risen body. The words affirm both the identity of Jesus and the substantiality of His manifestation of Himself; the Risen Body could be made tangible as well as visible. (Compare the challenge to Thomas, John xx. 27, and the prohibition of Mary, ver. 17.) Mary recognized Him by the familiar tone of the voice (ver. 16), and the two disciples by the familiar gesture in breaking bread (Luke xxiv. 31). There is, therefore, resemblance as well as difference in the body.

(5) It is possible that there was during the forty days a gradual process of glorification of the Risen Body, and that this process was completed at the Ascension. The appearance of Jesus to Saul on the way to Damascus is described in very different terms than any of the manifestations during the forty days. "Suddenly there shone round about him a light out of heaven," . . . "and when his eyes were opened, he saw nothing" (Acts ix. 3-8). The words of Jesus also indicate such a process. "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended unto the Father; but go unto my brethren, and say to them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and My God and your God" (John xx. 17). He is ascending, but not yet ascended. The glorious and beatific vision and communion is still anti-

culated, it is not yet experienced. So much at least the words must mean. It is vain for us to conjecture whether He was still in Paradise, the abode of the blessed in Hades, the intermediate state, and had not yet passed to the perfect glory and blessedness of His Father's Presence, whether the visible and tangible manifestations of Himself during the forty days were in accord with the laws of that mode of existence, whether that He might taste death for every man, pass through the complete experience of dying, it was necessary that His ascension should thus for a brief period be delayed. This, however, may be said, that probably these forty days were significant for Jesus as well as His disciples. Before attempting by means of other utterances to define what this ascension meant for Jesus, we must inquire why this anticipation was given as the reason for the prohibition of the tokens of affection, which Mary in the delight of her discovery attempted to bestow on Him. As the connexion between the prohibition and the explanation is by no means obvious, other reasons for the former have been sought, and may at the outset be set aside. The action was not forbidden as indecorous, for Jesus allowed the sinful woman thus to show her devotion (Luke vii. 45). Mary was not forbidden to test the reality of Christ's presence by touch; for there is no suggestion that that was her intention; and had it been, Jesus would not have refused it, as He offered it to Thomas (John xx. 27). It is a mere speculation that the embrace would have hindered the process of glorification. Had it been adoration Mary offered, that would not have been refused, for it was accepted from Thomas (ver. 28). Jesus describes the goal towards which He is moving in order to make clear to Mary that the starting-point of the path has once for all been left behind. Her act assumed a restoration of the former intimate associations, the loving intercourse which had

been enjoyed during the earthly life of Jesus. She needed to be taught that that relationship was for ever ended. He who was ascending to the Father after the conquest of death could not return to the former conditions even in His relationship to His loved friends. A spiritual communion would take the place of the intimacy that found expression in outward tokens of affection. The present was a period of transition when the old bonds could not be restored, but when the new links could be prepared. Just as at the beginning of His ministry Jesus had to disown the claim of His mother to control the exercise of His powers (John ii. 4), and at its close in bequeathing her to His beloved disciple (xix. 26, 27) He had to sever the natural relationship, so now He had to raise Mary from the lower to the higher fellowship.

(6) The necessary change of relationship did not involve any alteration in the affection. The love of Jesus for His own had survived death. Was it the instinct of the heart to meet His disciples again amid familiar surroundings which would recall their common life and work which prompted His first command, "Go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see Me" (Matt. xxviii. 10)? Was it the impatience of love that urged Him to come into their midst in the Upper Room (Luke xxiv. 36)? Did their misery, doubt, fear, bewilderment, which even His message through the women to whom He appeared could not remove so touch His heart that He could no longer withhold the help and comfort of His Presence from them? The Gospels do not offer us the materials to answer these questions; but it is probable that in the condition of the disciples, and the adaptation of Christ's grace to their need lies the solution of the problems that our fragmentary records leave unsolved. There were three services that the love of Jesus had to render to His

disciples in His intercourse with them after the Resurrection. He had first of all to remove their helpless and hopeless grief on account of His death. This feature of His ministry to their need is made prominent in the record of the walk to Emmaus. His rebuke and His argument alike prove the continuity of His dealing with His disciples. "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into His glory?" (Luke xxiv. 25-26). As has been shown in previous studies Jesus Himself learned His vocation and the method of its fulfilment from meditation on the Holy Scriptures. He in the training of the Twelve in preparation for His Passion made His appeal to the same authority. The disciples should have been prepared both for the death and for the rising again; and should not have been comfortless regarding the one, and hopeless of the other. It was no mere accommodation to their Jewish beliefs that made Him now repeat this argument; it had significance and value for Him now as before, for in His filial consciousness the one fatherly will joined prophecy and fulfilment. The general statement in ver. 27, "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, He interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself," does not affirm Jesus' responsibility for the use of this method which was current in the Christian Church, and which from the standpoint of a historical interpretation of the Old Testament is open to objection. We may assume that on this occasion Christ used the Scriptures as He had been in the habit of doing; and if so, then the argument is as valid for us to-day as it was for the disciples then. Even the Risen Lord found in prophecy the assurance of the necessity of the death He had experienced and the certainty of the Ascension, "the entrance into glory," which He was still anticipating.

(7) The second service which He had to render to His disciples was to assure them of the reality of the Resurrection, and His own personal identity. When He appeared to the Eleven in the Upper Room He offered them the test of touch (Luke xxiv. 38-49, John xx. 20), and even partook of food (Luke xxiv. 41-43). His conversation with Thomas showed His anxiety that they should be thoroughly persuaded; but also His disappointment that they should need so much persuading. "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (John xx. 29). The rebuke applies to the other disciples as well as Thomas. His teaching regarding His death and resurrection with its appeal to prophecy, confirmed by the message to meet Him in Galilee which He had entrusted to the women, should have been sufficient evidence of His resurrection to His disciples. Thomas differed from the others only in being more persistent in his doubt, for he resisted their additional testimony. Just as Jesus rated low the faith that rested on His miracles during His earthly ministry (John iv. 48) so belief in His resurrection which needed these sensible proofs was less satisfactory to Him, because showing less spiritual discernment than a humble and confident trust in His word. It was a disappointment to Jesus that His teaching had failed to sustain the hope of His disciples through the trial of His death. It is not unlikely that Jesus Himself would have esteemed the *Easter-faith*, the conviction that His life and work were of such infinite value to God that He must prove the conqueror of death, without the *Easter-message*—the sensible evidences of the reality of His Resurrection—as much more precious than this belief which rested on the signs of sense. But the narratives make plain and certain that the disciples were quite incapable of the *Easter-faith*, and only very

reluctantly accepted the *Easter-message*. As during His earthly life He had been alone, misunderstood and even mistrusted by His disciples, so even after His Resurrection He was solitary. He looked for faith without sight and found it not. His Presence of love at first awakened doubt and fear; but the persistent energy of His love at last conquered dread and unbelief.

(8) The third service was this: having restored their faith, hope, love towards Himself, He had to commit to them the work which it was appointed of God that they should do. Their calling was to be that of "witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts i. 8). They were to continue His work on earth. "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you" (John xx. 21). They were being sent as witnesses "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His Name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem" (Luke xxiv. 47). Their commission is expressly set forth in the words, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you" (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). Their authority in dealing with the souls of men is to be as Christ's own. "Whosoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whosoever sins ye retain they are retained" (John xx. 23). Even if in some of these sayings there is "summed up the Church's confession of faith conceived as uttered by the lips of the Risen One" (Bruce, *Expositor's Greek Testament*, i. p. 340), yet the teaching of Jesus in His earthly life presents Him as the sole Revealer of God as Father, and the sole Redeemer of all mankind from sin, guilt, death, doom. The mission of the disciples was to bear this message to all the nations; and whether in

these exact words or not the commission did come to the Church from the lips of the Risen Lord Himself. That Jesus after as before His Resurrection was conscious of His own absolute worth to, and His own universal claim on, all mankind it seems impossible to doubt. To the writer it does not seem at all improbable that Christ's own consciousness of what ascension to the Father meant for Him is expressed in the assurance, "All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth" (Matt. xxviii. 18), and the promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (ver. 20). The history of the spread of the Gospel and the growth of the Kingdom throughout the centuries, and the experience of Christian believers in all generations confirm the truth of both sayings. As the Son most fully and clearly revealing God, and as the Saviour delivering mankind from the greatest evil, it is fitting to His function that local manifestations should be changed to universal presence, and that His authority, though delegated and mediatorial, should be freed from the limitations which the conditions of incarnation necessarily involved. So indissolubly connected with His person and work are divine revelation and human redemption, so complete is the union of the Son with the Father, that it may be affirmed with confidence that wherever God is and works in grace, there is the Risen Lord, ascended to the Father. It does seem to the writer not only possible, but even necessary, to assign to the Ascension this significance and value as the continuation of the process begun at the Resurrection. Although the words that express Jesus' consciousness of His exaltation were spoken before His ascension, yet it is evident that they are prophetic, as the seals attached to the commission given to the disciples, the fulfilment of which, however, still lay in the future, and was dependent on their endowment with power from on high.

(9) The promise of the Spirit was repeated on several occasions by the Risen Lord. His words to the Eleven, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John xx. 22), accompanied by the symbolic act of breathing upon them, were evidently prophetic (if the Fourth Evangelist has not anticipated events in his record), as in the parallel narrative in Luke it is a promise which is given, for the fulfilment of which the disciples are enjoined to wait. "Behold I send forth the promise of My Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high" (xxiv. 49). In the record of the Ascension in Acts the same promise and the same injunction are given (i. 4, 5, 8). What then was this power from on high? The descent of the Spirit at Pentecost is often misrepresented both as regards its character and conditions. The abnormal accompaniments were of secondary importance; the primary feature was the holy enthusiasm which possessed the apostolic company. Confidence and courage took the place of uncertainty and despondency. The boldness of Peter and John was what most impressed the Jewish Sanhedrim (Acts iv. 13). Enthusiasm begets energy, spiritual vitality shows itself in moral vigour. The power the disciples received as witnesses was that of absolute certainty in their convictions regarding the Risen Lord. Hence the descent of the Spirit was not unprepared, not unconnected with the condition of the disciples resulting from their intercourse with Christ. When faith in His absolute authority and universal presence triumphed over all their doubts and fears, and took complete possession of them, then the Spirit came upon them. Fellowship with the Risen Lord, the living Christ, is ever the condition of being filled with the Holy Spirit.

(10) To pursue this subject would, however, lead us beyond the limits prescribed for these *Studies*, and we

must turn from it to consider two manifestations of the Risen Lord, which have not yet been brought into the discussion, one because of its peculiar place in the evangelical testimony, and the other because it was subsequent to the Ascension. The appendix to the Fourth Gospel (chapter xxi.) is an addition not only outside its plan, but evidently included at a later date to remove a current misconception of a traditional saying about the beloved disciple (ver. 23). It has already been mentioned that the first part (verses 1-14) presents a parallel to the account Luke (v. 1-11) gives of the call of Peter, and although there are differences in details it is impossible to affirm confidently that it cannot be a variant tradition of the same occurrence. The second part (15-23), if detached from the first, offers no indication of time and place. These difficulties must be recognized. Nevertheless the conversation of Jesus with Peter is one which it would cause us keen regret to lose. Without laying any emphasis on the different meaning of the words ἀγαπᾶς and φιλεῖς both translated "lovest thou," or any of the other variations of language, we must be impressed by the grace of Jesus, which that the restoration to service might be complete pressed for a full repentance. The question "lovest thou Me more than these?" was doubtless intended to recall to Peter his foolish boast, "Although all shall be offended, yet will not I" (Mark xiv. 29). Dr.¹Dods' great authority as an expositor cannot convince me that this is not the only possible reference. See *Expositor's Greek Testament*, i. p. 870). The threefold repetition of the question would remind him of his threefold denial. Peter's grief was the sorrow of penitence, as his words "Thou knowest all things" were its confession. He remembered the guilty past which his Lord knew, and yet dared to claim that he still loved. If there is no joy like the joy of forgiveness, surely it was a most gracious

act of Christ's grace that He gave Peter the opportunity of penitence, and Himself the occasion for pardon. Must one not add that surely that grace was shown as soon as possible, and that one is inclined to sacrifice the historical accuracy of the writer of this appendix to the Fourth Gospel, so that one may identify this meeting of Jesus and Peter with that mentioned in Luke's Gospel (xxiv. 34)? One may ask, would Peter unpardoned have been found in the Apostolic company? Could the loving heart of Jesus have left him so long un comforted? The incident loses much of its significance if placed at a later date and after another meeting with Jesus; surely the restoration to apostleship must have taken place at the first and not the second meeting. The writer must leave these suggestions, as a definite answer is unattainable.

(11) Paul regarded the appearance of Christ to himself on the way to Damascus as having the same character as the manifestation of the Risen Christ before the Ascension. This does not exclude the possibility already suggested, that the mode of the appearance, although not less objective, was different, as Christ had ascended to the Father. The form of Christ was invested in dazzling splendour. Without here discussing the attempts to explain this vision subjectively, and assuming its objectivity, we may now call attention to two indications which the narrative affords of the inner life of the ascended Lord. In the parable of the judgment He had identified Himself with the people in regarding service rendered to them as to Him, and neglect of them as of Him (Matt. xxv. 40, 45). So here the persecution of His Church is persecution of Himself, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest" (Acts ix. 5). He, the High Priest within the veil, is touched with the feeling of our infirmities; He sorrows, suffers, struggles with us. The spread of His Gospel and the growth of the Kingdom are still His interest.

The Lord describes Saul to Ananias as “a chosen vessel unto Me, to bear My name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel (ver. 15).” Must we not ask, were none of the vessels already chosen worthy and fit for this service? The hesitation of the Apostles in regard to the admission of the Gentiles to the Church, their indifference to the fulfilment of their commission in its world-wide range, the opposition that Paul’s efforts afterwards met with from the church in Jerusalem, compel us to recognize that Jesus did not see the travail of His soul and was not satisfied with the work of His Apostles. The persecutor had by a violent birth (1 Cor. xv. 8, ὡσπερι τῷ ἐκτρώματι) to be made the preacher in order that the purpose of Christ might find fulfilment. The Lord appeared that the burden of His Church might be relieved, that the task of His Church might be discharged. Although such appearance is not now the means He uses, yet His passion with and His action in His Church, His body, “the fulfilment of Him that filleth all in all” (Eph. i. 23), are constant and universal. The “inner life” of Jesus which has been the subject of these *Studies*—His truth, holiness, grace—is always and everywhere the life of God in man, and man in God.

A. E. GARVIE.

PANTHEISM.

II.

THE agnostic element in the philosophy of Kant may be said to have culminated in the Synthetic Philosophy of Herbert Spencer. There is an Eternal Energy immanent in the world ; it is omnipotent and omnipresent, and from it all things proceed. None can escape from it, but its ways are past finding out. The old belief in the Personality of God, the ancient faith which rested in the self-conscious, purposive wisdom and love at the root of things has disappeared. It is quite true that Spencer equally discouraged other attempts at finding a dogmatic basis for Materialism, Atheism, and other -isms which had played a large part in the speculation of men. If he discountenanced the belief in a Personal God, he was equally decisive, in formal terms at least, against Materialism, and he had no sympathy with Atheism, taken as a dogmatic denial of the existence of God. His philosophy is antagonistic to any solution of the problem, or to any attempt to construe the ineffable mystery. He allows his readers to cast themselves prostrate before the majesty and mystery of the Ultimate Reality, but the reality remains for ever inaccessible to the knowledge of men. He will not deny any more than he will assert the existence of God, he will neither affirm Materialism nor deny it, he will only assert some Ultimate Reality, but what the reality is, he will not say. The ultimate reality cannot make itself known. Outside of the system in which it is, it has no way of manifesting itself, and all religious affirmations about God, or about any revelation He could make of Himself, and all religious affirmations about Him and His ways, are without a ground, and without a meaning. Yet the Ultimate Reality is an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed.

Nor has the influence of the tendency which culminated in Spencer been unfelt by the religious teachers of the time. The Spirit of the Age is always a real power over those who live within the age. Treatises appeared in which the agnostic philosophy of Hamilton played a conspicuous part. The classical illustration of the tendency is found in Mansel's Bampton Lecture, *The Limits of Religious Thought*. Many of these writers set themselves, with all diligence, to cut down the branch on which they sat, and cut it down between the place where they were perched and the place where it was attached to the tree. They sought to prove that science was as baseless as theology, and they sought a city of refuge in some appeal to authority. Nor can one forget the attempt of Matthew Arnold to find a substitute for the idea of a Personal God, which would yet preserve the essential function of Christianity—"a power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness." Or, more elaborately, "the stream of tendency by which all things strive to fulfil the law of their being." This is not the place to speak of the graceful style of that fascinating writer, nor to appraise the literary worth of his attempt. We note that Arnold was under the impression that he was setting Christianity free from the burden laid on it by the Aberglaube of successive generations of Christians. Other illustrations might be given, but the main thing to note is that all these agnostic ways led back to Kant, and sprung from one side of his system. It is a fair question whether Agnosticism was a legitimate outgrowth of his philosophy. But that is too large a question to be discussed here. His distinction between theoretical and practical knowledge, and his attempt to find a regulative use for principles which he had already tried before the bar of Pure Reason, and had found incompetent, led in the direction of Agnosticism, whether it be of the type of Spencer

or of Arnold. The result has been that there was a belief in the immanence of a power in the universe, of which the only thing that could be said was that it was there. Agnostic immanence is the final outcome.

But another stream of tendency had its source in Kant. Absolute Idealism or, as it is sometimes called, Transcendentalism, though repudiated by him, still arose from his transcendental argument, mainly by a transformation of his procedure, which turned his philosophy into a metaphysical instead of a critical philosophy. Absolute Idealism may be briefly described as the system of philosophy which describes the universe as spirit. The idea of spirit is derived from the conception of spirit as experienced by ourselves. The human spirit as manifested in its moral, cognitive, and volitional activity is universalized, freed from limitations, and regarded as absolute. It has various forms, and one has a wide choice of works in which it may be studied at the present time. One may read it in Green, or in the Cairds, one may find expositions of it in Haldane's, or in Laurie's, or in Royce's Gifford Lectures. In fact, there are many works of pre-eminent ability in which readers may find expositions of the Idealism which has had so great an influence on contemporary life and thought. One thing common to them all, in their idealistic construction of experience, is that they derive existence from a single type, that the subject-object unity is the rubric of explanation of all reality and of all experience.

It may be well to see how this transformation of the Kantian principle arose. Perhaps the shortest way to the apprehension of this transformation is to state again what Kant meant by the process which he called the "Transcendental Deduction." This was an analysis of experience with a view to discovering the categories, or formal principles of thought implied in its meaning. It was through the opera-

tion of these categories that experience was possible. Kant had accepted many non-philosophical truths. In particular he accepted the truths of science, and of the moral consciousness. The order of nature as formulated in the system of Newton, and the moral order as revealed in the consciousness of duty, were accepted by him. His inquiry was as to the ground on which these convictions rested, and as to the principles which gave them validity. Experience, the very least experience of which a man is conscious, was either an experience of nature or of duty. What is involved in such an experience? Any object experienced will be experienced within space and time. These he calls the forms of intuition. But an experienced object is experienced as something. It persists through changes of position and quality. It is related to other things, and so Kant reaches what he calls the categories of the understanding. For both intuition and understanding are necessary in order that an object may be recognized as an object. These principles of thought are shown to be implicit in all experience. They are universal and necessary, for they are the conditions not of any particular experience, but of experience in general. Their implicit presence in experience in general, Kant calls their transcendental character, and the process by which they become explicit is shown in what he calls the transcendental deduction.

It is necessary to remember the limited range which Kant ascribed to the transcendental categories. They do not apply beyond experience. In two ways the limitation applies as set forth by Kant. In the first place they have no meaning beyond experience. Categories without perceptions are empty, just as perceptions without categories are blind. The method of Kant thus suggested the conception of a standard Mind as the standard to which adequate experience might be referred. But while this was the

route chosen by his successors, it was closed to Kant, by the principle that the categories could work only in the way of setting in order what was given in the manifold of experience. In the second place the categories suggested that the orderly arrangements of experience implied a perfect system. The ideas and ideals of that system might possibly be set forth, but inasmuch as such a system is not indispensable to experience, Kant would not attribute reality to it. In other words, the system of Kant is a critical philosophy, a logical and analytical study of the special terms and relations of human knowledge. It is of worth within this sphere, it has no validity beyond it.

But with his successors a criticism became a system of metaphysics. The suggestion of a perfect mind which seemed to be latent in the Kantian system was taken as real, and what Kant regarded as mere abstract conditions became in their hands concrete and metaphysical realities. The ideals and ideas of a perfected system of knowledge, which in the Kantian system was limited to the actual experiences of man, became an absolute system which, whether applicable to human experience or no, was real to the standard mind. Kant "is dealing," he says, "not with any individual mind or consciousness, but with consciousness in general, with the conditions of possible experience," "the unity of possible consciousness," or, as he calls it in another place, with "the logical form of all cognition," with the ultimate nature, as we might say, of knowledge as knowledge. The transcendental logic, in a word, is a study of knowledge *in abstracto*. But just because of this perfectly general or abstract character which belongs to the investigation, the results of the investigation must also be perfectly general or abstract. They will be abstract conditions, not concrete facts or metaphysical realities. The analysis reveals to us, according

to its own claims, certain conditions which must be fulfilled in every instance of actual knowledge—certain categories or fundamental modes of connexion, and as a supreme condition, the unity of the pure Ego—but it deals itself with no actual knower, whether human or divine. It deals, in a word, with possible consciousness, or consciousness in general, which so long as it remains general is of course a pure abstraction. (Prof. A. Seth Pringle Pattison, *Hegelianism and Personality*, pp. 30-31.)

The transformation of the critical philosophy into a metaphysic is found in the works of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel. The same transformation has reappeared within the past few years again in German philosophy. The analysis of consciousness in general led on to the hypothesis of a universal self-consciousness for which the world is. The subject-object view, which lies at the basis of human knowledge, was universalized, and made into a formula of explanation both of the world and of God. The conclusion inevitably follows that the world is the other of God, and that the world is as necessary to God as God is to the world. But this development, though suggested by the Kantian system, was illegitimate on his principles. For the analysis of consciousness in general was undertaken by him with a view to the vindication of human knowledge, as a possible experience. With this aim he abstracted consciousness from any particular knower, and considered it simply as the presupposition of knowledge. Abstraction of consciousness from every particular self of experience does not imply that we are analysing an absolute self-consciousness or the self-consciousness of God. The transcendental theory of knowledge necessarily implies a single self, or logical subject. But it is a long step to assume that this analysis of consciousness in general gives us the right to infer only a single intelligence for which all things are. It may

explain the experience of a single self or intelligence, it is powerless to state whether there are more intelligences than one.

This is, however, precisely the step which is taken by all absolute idealists, and it necessarily leads to a unity which is really pantheistic. It is one thing to show how a manifold of sense is organized into unity and order by the application of the categories of the understanding, and, further, to show that the order thus attained is possible only on the presupposition that this is a rational universe; it is another thing to assume that this is possible only on the supposition that the universe as it is, is only one experience, and that the experience of an absolute self. The problem of knowledge is one thing, the problem of metaphysics is another, and epistemology cannot become a metaphysic simply by assuming that the abstract concept rules the universe.

To trace the process by which the concept of consciousness in general became the absolute single experience of absolute Idealism would be to trace the process of philosophy from Kant through Fichte, Schelling, to the absolute intellectualism of Hegel. It would be necessary also to go outside that stream, and to say something about Schopenhauer and his successor Van Hartmann. It might be noticed also that a similar movement has risen in Germany in the present century, and German philosophy has run a parallel course to that which obtained in the beginning of the nineteenth century, and to-day, after a period of eclipse, the system of Hegel is again in the ascendant. We quote from an able account of "Philosophy in Germany" in the May number of the *Philosophical Review* from the pen of Dr. Oscar Ewald. "The strictly intellectualistic tendency of modern German thought culminated in Hegel. By looking back we can fix upon three tendencies that dominate our time, all of which find in Hegel their starting

point. In the first place, the transcendental, logical tendency which, excluding all empiricism and psychology, aims to deduce the fundamental characteristics and categories of knowing from pure concepts. "Secondly, the metaphysical tendency, which was active in Neo-Fichteianism, as well as in the Philosophy of the Unconscious, and which manifested itself as a reaction against the strictly immanent principle of Positivism. Thirdly, the monistic tendency, which clung to the unitary character of the metaphysical ultimate. These several tendencies found support in Kant's philosophy, but could not be brought to equilibrium in it. Because of his being divided between psychology and logic, Kant could not be a pure transcendentalist. Further, because he established no distinct boundaries between immanent and transcendent reality, he never became a clear metaphysician. Further, he was and remained a dualist, so far as he advocated the irreconcilability and incompatibility of sensibility and reason, of the empirical and intelligible worlds. Hegel, on the contrary, is a pure logician, for he ascribes to the self-unfolding concept dominion over all reality, over form and content. He is a metaphysician, for he hypostatizes the concept; he must hypostatize it, because a productive principle that creates reality represents not merely essence but an existence, a real being. He is a monist, in so far as he is a panlogist, in so far as he identifies the universe with a logical function." (*The Philosophical Review*, May, pp. 249-50.)

The main question of present philosophy in Germany is as to the value to be assigned to the categories of the transcendental logic. It is agreed that they are constitutive for our knowledge and for our conception of objective reality. Are they to have the same reality and independence claimed for the formal laws of thought, or are they to be

regarded and applied merely as rules for the relating of psychological processes? The Neo-Hegelian school tend to the view that they are valid, and are eternal, though no human beings were ever conscious of them.

Without entering further into the history of the theory of absolute Idealism, it may be well to state briefly some forms of it which are in vogue at the present hour. There is essential agreement about the truth of Idealism by the advocates of that view, whether we read the works of the Cairds, of Royce, of McTaggart, of Laurie, of Bradley, or of Professor Baillie. They all regard the universe as experience, as that of a single life, or as the expression of an absolute, single Self-Consciousness. No doubt there are differences, and each of these distinguished men has something peculiar to himself. Royce, for example, strives to get away from the intellectualism of Hegel, and to recognize what is true in the contribution of Schopenhauer. So he lays stress on the meaning, on the purpose, on the will, and seeks to do justice to all interests. McTaggart seeks to find the ultimate reality in a "Harmonious system of Selves," and to regard it as a community in which there may not be a universal self-consciousness, but only a system of selves conscious of one another; but there is no self-consciousness for which all things are. Green, again, thinks that the universal self-consciousness is active in every particular consciousness. Let us have some specimens.

"And now what our fourth conception asserts is that God's life—for God's life we must now call this absolute fulfilment which our fourth conception defines—sees the one plan fulfilled through all the manifold lives, the single consciousness winning its purpose by virtue of all the ideas, of all the individual lives, and of all the lives. No finite view is wholly illusory. Every finite intent, taken precisely in its wholeness, is fulfilled in the absolute. The

least life is not neglected, the most fleeting act is a recognized part of the world's meaning. You are for the divine view all that you know yourself at this instant to be. But you are also infinitely more. The preciousness of your present purposes to yourself is only a hint of the preciousness which in the end links their meaning to the entire realm of being." (*The World and the Individual*, pp. 426-7.) He sums up his view in his controversy with Professor Howison as follows: "The entire world of truth, natural and ethical, must be present in the unity of a single absolute consciousness." (*The Conception of God*, p. 329.) The full development of his subtile and fascinating view will be found in his various works, *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy*, *The Spirit of Modern Philosophy*, *The Conception of God*, and in the two volumes of his *Gifford Lectures*. Professor Royce strives to do justice to all interests, and almost alone of all idealists strives to pass beyond the intellectualism of Hegel, and to do justice to the aspects of will and purpose. He strives also to save the individual self from being a mere aspect of the universal self. But, with all respect to his profound and elaborate argument, we do not think that all interests have been conserved. Of this more in the sequel.

As to the thesis of Professor Royce quoted above, that the entire world of truth must be present in the unity of a Single Absolute consciousness, it may be well to hear what Mr. McTaggart has to say. Dr. Rashdall, in *Personal Idealism* (p. 393), had written regarding Mr. McTaggart: "Mr. McTaggart feels that the world must be a unity, that it consists not merely of souls but of related and interconnected souls which form a system. But a system for whom? The idea of a system which is not 'for' any mind is not open to an idealist; and the idea of a world each part of which is known to some mind but is not known as

a whole to any Mind is equally difficult. Where, then, in his view, is the mind that knows the whole? i.e. the whole system of souls with the content of each." To which argumentation the significant reply is made: "I cannot see that it is at all necessary for an idealist to admit that nothing can exist except that which is *for* a mind. There is no doubt a school of Idealism which maintains this. It has been that to Be is to be Perceived, or that to Be is to be Thought. To such Idealism, certainly, Dr. Rashdall's argument applies. If all reality is a system, and if only that has being which is known, then some person must know the system, and so know all reality.

"There is, however, another form of Idealism—the form which seems to me to be true—which is not liable to these criticisms. This form of Idealism does not say that nothing can be real except what is known. It says that nothing can exist but persons—conscious beings, who know, will and feel. To the traditional expression of the first-mentioned school, *esse est percipi*; the adherents of the second view might, for the sake of antithesis, oppose the maxim *esse est percipere*. But it must always be remembered that such a formula sacrifices accuracy to antithesis, since persons have other activities as fundamental as knowledge. Now, if we take this view, there seems to be no difficulty at all in saying that certain aspects of reality are unknown to every one." (*Some Dogmas of Religion*, pp. 251–2.) The main contention of McTaggart is contradictory to the thesis of Professor Royce cited above. For he affirms that if spirit is the only reality, we may conceive the universe (*a*) as a unity in which selves are united by laws of a mechanical nature, in which case there would be some difficulty in dispensing with the idea of a directing mind, though not so much as if the existence of matter was admitted. If we conceive the universe (*b*) as a unity which

possesses spiritual significance and value, there is no need for a directing mind to account for traces of order in it. The existence of such a unity would then be a fundamental fact of the universe. What is fundamental to such idealists as Royce, the Cairds, and other exponents of the Absolute Self-Consciousness as the pre-supposition of a real universe is calmly set aside by Mr. McTaggart, by the assumption that while the whole may be known by the parts, the parts are, or may not be known by the whole. "God is a community, and every man is part of it. In a perfect unity, such as God is, the parts are not subordinate to the whole. The whole is in every part, and every part is essential to the whole. Every man is thus a perfect manifestation of God. He would not be such a manifestation of God, indeed, if he were taken in isolation, but being taken in the community, he embodies God perfectly." (*Hegelian Cosmogony*, p. 243.) Still another form of Idealism is found in Mr. Bradley's various works, specially in his *Appearance and Reality*. In some respects it is peculiar, as it is certainly the most thorough-going and the most drastic in his criticism of what he calls appearance and reality. What is not complete, self-explanatory, consistent, and without contradiction is appearance for him and not reality. Thus all finite things and finite selves can only be appearance, there is no reality, or only certain degrees of reality, in anything save the Absolute. It is consistent, self-explanatory, free from contradiction, but the Absolute has to pay a large price for its perfection and completeness. "The Absolute is not personal, nor is it moral, nor is it beautiful or true. And yet, in these denials we may be falling into worse mistakes, for it would be far from incorrect to assert that the Absolute is either false, or ugly, or bad, or is something even beneath the application of predicates such as these. And it is better to affirm personality than to call the Absolute

impersonal. But neither mistake should be necessary. The Absolute stands above, and not below its internal distinctions. It does not eject them, but includes them as elements in its fulness. To speak in other language, it is not the indifference, but the concrete identity of all extremes. But it is better in this connexion to call it super-personal." (*Appearance and Reality*, p. 533.)

These may suffice as indications of the idealistic solution of the problems of life and thought. Discounting for the moment the individual differences manifested in the expositions of Royce, McTaggart and Bradley, or the differences of exposition of such writers as the Cairds, Haldane, Laurie and Baillie, we note that there are fundamental points affirmed by the whole school. The ultimate unity may be a community according to McTaggart, or according to others it must be "single life," one experience, or an Absolute Self-Consciousness for which all things are. Discounting the individual differences of exposition, the common result may be thus expressed. They all hold that there is but one reality, one substance which is spirit, which is the absolute cause and ground of all phenomena, and that this reality is the deeper self which we find at the core of our own self-consciousness. It protests that it does not deserve the name of Pantheism. It asserts itself to be the true Theism, which lies between the extremes of Deism and Pantheism, and, avoiding the partial view of both, sets forth the truth in fulness at which they severally aim.

Nor can we forget that many of this school claim that they alone give to Christianity its rights, and that their view alone can vindicate its claim to be the absolute religion. We recall Hegel's tribute to Christianity, and his translation of Christian dogmas into the formulæ of his own philosophy. Nor can we forget the number of treatises

on Dogmatic written by theologians under the influence of Hegel. It may be well to remember also the performances of the negative school of the Hegelian tradition, and think of Strauss and Vatke and others who applied the Hegelian formulae to history and religion. As to Hegel's own interpretation of Christianity one had better read McTaggart's account of it in *The Cosmogony of Hegel*. The most fascinating application of the principles of Absolute Idealism to the explanation of Christianity is to be found in the writings of the late Principal Caird, and of his brother the Master of Balliol. These writings may be described as an Apology for Christianity. It is recognized now by all Christian apologists worthy of the name that to defend Christianity with Hegelian weapons is to surrender at the outset all the distinguishing marks of Christianity. It transforms Christianity beyond all recognition. Facts disappear, doctrines vanish, experience distinctively Christian is evaporated, and we are left with nothing save the ideas disembodied in the religion. History and Fact are merely scaffolding useful for the introduction of the Ideas, but as soon as the ideas are there the facts may usefully disappear.

To objective Idealism there is only one principle of explanation, whether the thing to be explained is our own existence or the existence of the universe. Science and religion are two forms of the same spiritual movement, and what we call matter is the lowest mode of the manifestation of spirit. The criticism of this is reserved for the next article. Meanwhile it may be well to track the influence of this movement on those who are not formally objective idealists, but who have been so far influenced by it. The name of these is legion, and when they deal with the question they deal with it mainly under the name of the Immanence of God. How widely spread is this movement every reader knows. One finds it in sermons, in religious treatises, and

in formal works of theology. It is sometimes stated rashly, as if St. Paul had said God lives and moves and has His being in us, instead of what he actually did say, "In Him we live and move and have our being." The Immanence of God may be stated in such a way as to obliterate all distinction between Him and the world.

One illustration of this tendency may be taken from Lotze, of whom and of whose works we would speak with the highest admiration. Of his contribution to the great category of Personality, and of the possible Personality of the infinite we need only say that it is of the highest value for theology and for life. But even Lotze, in his search after a principle of unity, yielded to the desire to find the principle in what Professor James calls "one block." He could find no ground for interaction between the various beings of the universe save on the hypothesis that they have one ground. "There cannot be a multiplicity of independent things, but all elements, if reciprocal action is to be possible between them, must be regarded as parts of a single and real being." (Lotze's *System of Philosophy, Metaphysic—*English translation, p. 125.) The view of Lotze has been expounded and illustrated with great ability by Professor Bowne, of Boston, in his various works, specially in his *Metaphysic, his Theism*, and in his latest work, *The Immanence of God*. The question we raise at the conclusion of this article is whether in our search after unity the only possible solution is that of a unity of one kind, whether that kind is represented as the unity of one Experience, or that of a single life, or that of a universal self-consciousness, or that of a single and real being? Are we limited to that quantitative sort of solution? Or may there be a unity of another kind, which will allow us to think of God as something in and for Himself, and of the world as real, and of the selves in it as real and related to the world, to each other,

and to God in a spiritual system, not the less real though it is not expressed in a quantitative fashion? We shall seek to answer this question in our next article.

JAMES IVERACH.

*THE NEWLY RECOVERED TREATISE OF
IRENAEUS.*

Des heiligen Irenäus els ἐπίδειξιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος. Von Dr. Karapet Mekerttschian und Dr. Erwand Minassiantz, mit einem Nachwort, etc., von Adolf Harnack. Leipzig, 1907.

THIS volume gives us a work, hitherto lost, of Irenaeus. It is true that it does not contain very much that we did not know before of Christian teaching towards the end of the second century; and yet it is important because it outlines, in a concise and simple way, the catechetical instruction communicated by a bishop of that age to an educated believer. An orthodox and cultivated clergyman of this generation contrasting this *summa theologiae* of Irenaeus with his own beliefs will note two chief points of difference. On the one hand the importance which Irenaeus attaches to the proof from prophecy; for two-thirds of the work are an elaboration of the theme that Jesus of Nazareth was Messiah, because every phase and act of His life fulfilled and fitted in with some prophecy or another—a type of argumentation which a better informed Hebrew learning is rapidly banishing among modern divines, although it was the staple for many centuries of Christian apologetic. On the other hand, there is barely any hint of the great Christological controversies which were to rend the Church asunder in the fourth and fifth centuries. However, as Harnack notes in one passage, chap. 47, Irenaeus draws very close to the Nicene position. I translate it:

Accordingly the Father is Lord and the Son is Lord, and the Father is God, and the Son God, because he that is begotten of God

is God. And thus according to substance (*οὐσία*) and power of his essence (*or* Being) one God is shewn, although according to economic administration of our salvation both Son and Father; inasmuch as the Father of all created beings is invisible and inaccessible. They who are destined to approach God must by means of the Son have access and guidance to the Father (cp. Eph. iii. 12).

The Archimandrite Karapet is to be congratulated on his discovery of this Armenian text in the Armenian church of Erivan, where I was assured some twenty years ago that there were no manuscripts and was shown nothing. We may fairly expect more discoveries of the kind from Armenia now that there are clergymen on the spot who are learned and know what to look for. It had long been known that the works of Irenaeus existed in an ancient Armenian version. Stephanus Roszka, a Polish Armenian (1670–1739), had them in his possession, and gave many citations of them in a dictionary which he made. There was also a copy in a Madras collection of Armenian codices which was lost through shipwreck off the Cape of Good Hope in 1832.

The German translation is very accurate, and a student of Irenaeus will seldom fail to recognize with help of it the sense of the original. A few passages, of some of which Harnack in his notes remarks that they are obscure, admit of being cleared up. Thus in chap. 5 the German translator renders :

Weil nun das Wort festmacht, d. h. Fleisch werden lässt und die Wesenheit der Emanation verleiht."

And Harnack notes :

"Der Text ist an dieser Stelle wohl verderbt."

It is not really so. The Greek original can easily be restored, and ran somewhat as follows :

ἐπειδὴ οὖν ὁ λόγος στερεοῖ, τούτεστι σωματοποιεῖ καὶ οὐσίαν χαρίζειται τῷ ὄντι (or τῷ γεγονότι).

There is no need to take *eloy* in the Armenian in the sense

of *emanation*, for it constantly occurs in versions as a rendering of *ὄντος* or *ὄντι*. The word *σωματοποιέω* is also frequent in late Greek in the sense of to revive, strengthen, or refresh.

In chapter xii. the German text, "bestellte er ihn auch an und für sich zum Herrn derjenigen, welche Knechte auf ihr sind," is erroneous. The sense is this :

"Now having made man lord of the earth and of all those things which are therein, he secretly established him lord also of those who therein are servants." The word rendered *an und für sich* means *κρυφῆ* or *λάθρα*. It was because Adam was outwardly a child, that his lordship over the angels began by being hidden and secret. So of Jesus the Messiah and Second Adam the fathers held that He was hidden until His glory and perfection were manifested in Jordan. For example, Chrysostom (ed. Montf. ii. 369e) : *οὐχ ὅτ' ἐτέχθη τότε πᾶσιν ἐγένετο κατὰδηλος ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἐβαπτίσατο*. And Jerome : "Absconditus est et non apparuit."

The German version of the next sentence is also wrong, if the Armenian text is rightly printed :

Doch jene waren in ihrer Vollkommenheit, der Herr aber, d. h. der Mensch, war klein, denn er war ein Kind, und es war für ihn erforderlich so heranwachsend zur Vollkommenheit zu gelangen.

It should be rendered thus :

Notwithstanding they were in their *might*, but the lord, that is, the man, was small (=pusillus), for he was a child, and it was necessary for him to grow and thus attain to perfection.

It occurs to me, however, that the rare word *kareluthiun*, "might" may be a printer's error for *katareluthiun*, "perfection," used just afterwards. In chapter 14, beginning of 228v, the rendering "in dem ihm zukommenden Rang" gives the true sense, but in the Armenian the word *yoroum* is a corruption of *yiuroum*, "in his rank and power."

In chapter 13 the German runs thus :

Gott selbst aber liess eine Verzückung über Adam kommen und liess ihn einschlafen ; und *da eine Tat aus der anderen folgt*, etc.

Harnack notes : "Nicht recht verständlich." The true sense is as follows :

But God Himself cast an ecstasy upon Adam, and put him to sleep, and in order that creature might be perfected out of creature, for there was no sleep in the garden, this (ecstasy) came upon Adam by God's will.

The idea is that it was needful for God by an express act of will to put Adam to sleep, because sleep was not natural to man before the Fall. This idea meets us in the Syriac Hymn of the Soul in the Acts of Thomas, and was common among the mediaeval cathars.¹

In chapter xviii., "Vermischungen zwischen verschiedenen Elementen" is incorrect. The Armenian involves "and since *illegitimate* connexions were formed on earth, for angels had connexion with daughters of the seed of men."

In chapter xix. the German should run thus :

Bis das Gericht von Gott über die Welt durch die Sintflut in der zehnten Generation *nach den Erstgeschaffenen* kam, in welcher Noah allein als gerecht erfunden wurde.

The translators set the italicised words out of place after the word *allein* ; but Noah was not the only just man since Adam, nor does the Armenian involve this order.

In chapter xxi. fol. 231r the *vox nihili ashogi* should be corrected to *azgi*, "race," which has been used in the context just before. This also improves the sense, which must be as follows :

This is the blessing's force, that the God and Lord of all became a heritage (or possession) of Sem's race, the blessing of his piety which sprouted (or germinated) reached unto Abraham, who in descent belonged to the tenth generation of the seed of Sem.

In the preceding chapter xx. in the sentence :

Dieser ist über sein Geschlecht gekommen, da er viele Nach-

¹ See my note on "The Idea of Sleep in the 'Hymn of the Soul'" in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1905, p. 609.

kommen auf der Erde erzeugte, während vierzehn Generationen *wild* her anwachsend, bis endlich sein Geschlecht, dem Gericht verfallen, von Gott abgemüht wurdet.

The word *wild* is probably a mistranslation of the Armenian words *i wayrast ouremn*, which seem rather to mean, "in a downward direction," as *khonarhast*, "in descent," is used below in chapter xxi. in the passage already commented on.

In chapter xxi. the text Genesis ix. 27 is rendered: "Weiten Raum schaffe Gott für Iaphet und er *wohne* in dem Haus Sems, Cham aber soll sein Knecht sein."

Why *wohne*? The Armenian *ôrhnestzê* signifies bless, and rendered literally is equivalent to *εὐλογεῖτω εἰς οἶκον*—an unusual construction. Probably the Armenian is corrupt, for *κατοικησάτω* is rendered immediately below.

The German version continues:

Und das soll bedeuten, am Ende der Zeiten ist (das Heil?) erschienen den Ausersehenen des Herrn aus der Berufung der Heiden, in dem Gott ihnen die Berufung erweitert hat.

The Armenian can be rendered word for word into Latin as follows, if we change the last letter *tz* of *erevetzelotz* into *y*, with which in uncials it is commonly confused:

Itidem est: in consummatione ævi germinavit (or effloruit) apparente Domino de uocatione gentium, extendens illis Deus uocationem.

In chapter xxvi., fol. 234r the German runs:

Der Finger Gottes aber ist das, was vom Vater zu dem heiligen Geist ausgestreckt ist.

Harnack justly notes: *das ist unklar.*

An infinitesimal change in the Armenian restores the sense, namely, the omission of the single letter *i* before *surb hogin*; for then the sense becomes *sanctus spiritus* instead of *in sanctum spiritum*. We must then interpret the passage thus:

"And the finger of God is that Holy Spirit who is extended from the Father,"

or in Greek, keeping the Armenian order of words :

ὁ δὲ δάκτυλος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐκτεινόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἅγιον πνεῦμα.

So Luke ii. 20 substitutes *finger* of God for the *Spirit of God* of Mark and Matthew; and in early representations of Christ's baptism a hand with outstretched index is depicted over His head.

In chapters xxxii. and xxxiii. the word *ἀνακεφαλαίωσις* lies behind the Armenian words rendered *nochmaligen Vollendung*.

In chapters xxxiii. the German is hardly as literal as it might be. I should render :

And as through a virgin who disobeyed man was crushed (*allisus est*) and falling died, so also, through a virgin who listened to the word of God, man, being resuscitated (= *ἀναζωπυρούμενος*), in (or by) life received life. For the Lord came to seek afresh the lost sheep, and man was the lost. And, therefore, any other creature he became not, but from that very same which had generation (*γένος*) from Adam he preserved the likeness of the creature.

Chapter xxxiv. :

Auch das Vergehen, welches durch das Holz stattgefunden hatte, wurde durch den Gehorsam des Holzes aufgelöst. Indem Gott (solche Fürsprache) erhörte, ist der Menschensohn an das Holz angeschlagen.

But the Greek text ran somewhat as follows :

καὶ τὰ διὰ τοῦ ξύλου ἁμαρτήματα ἐλύθη διὰ τὴν τοῦ ξύλου ὑπακοὴν ἣν ὑπακούσας θεοῦ ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου προσηλώθη τῷ ξύλῳ.

In chapter liii. is the following passage :

Und dass er wahrhafter Mensch werden sollte, hat er durch sein Essen im voraus angedeutet, auch dadurch dass er ihn ein Kind nennt, aber auch durch seine Namengebung—denn eben hierin besteht ein *Irrthum* in betreff des Geborenen—und er führt einen Doppelnamen.

The translator notes that the words in the parenthesis are nonsense, but a slight correction restores the sense. The word *moloruthiun*, which signifies *Irrthum*, is obviously a corruption of *soworuthiun* = "custom." In an uncial

MS. the two words are barely distinguishable from one another. So we get the following sense :

Also by reason of the calling him a child, nay even by reason of the assigning to him of a name, for this (i.e. name-giving) is a custom also in respect of the newly born.

The allusion lies of course to the rite of giving a name to a child on the eighth day after birth, which among Gentile converts took the place of circumcision. In Greek Euchologia this rite bears the title : "Prayer for the sealing of a child when it receives its name on the eighth day from its birth." It is not, of course, to be confused with baptism, with which the association of name-giving was late and secondary. Indeed the prayers of the name-giving rite assume that the child will only be baptized when it reaches full age, and it is asked that it may duly attain to the *καίρὸς εὐθερός*, or fitting season for full union with the Church by baptism. Irenaeus' attestation of the rite is interesting and important, inasmuch as on the strength of a passage in his works, which they distort and misunderstand, he has been claimed by Wall, Warren and others as the earliest authority for infant baptism.

A curious feature of this new tract is that it confirms and endorses the interpretation given in Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* ii. 33, 3, of John viii. 57 :

Quando enim eis dixit dominus : *Abraham pater vester exultavit ut videret diem meum, et vidit, et gavisus est, responderunt ei : Quinquaginta annos nondum habes, et Abraham vidisti ?* Hoc autem consequenter dicitur ei, qui iam xl annos excessit, quinquagesimum autem annum nondum attigit, non tamen multum a quinquagesimo anno absistit.

If Jesus nearly attained to the age of fifty, He must have survived the reign of Tiberius and lasted on into that of Claudius. Accordingly in chapter lxxiv. of this new tract we find the statement that "Herod, king of the Jews, and

Pontius Pilate, procurator (*lit.* regional head) of Claudius Caesar acting in concert, condemned Jesus to be crucified."

Harnack points out that Irenaeus must have set the crucifixion A.D. 41 at the earliest, for in that year Claudius succeeded Caligula. Pontius Pilate, however, had long before this quitted Judaea. Irenaeus' ignorance, if it be such, of so well known a fact is extraordinary; and goes far to shake our faith in his testimony to any historical fact whatever. Harnack rightly points out that the writer of the Fourth Gospel must himself have believed that Jesus attained the age of forty-six, since, in addition to the passage above adduced by Irenaeus, we read (John ii. 21) that the temple that was forty-six years in building, signified the temple of his own body. The task may fairly be left to those who still uphold the Johannine authorship of this Gospel of explaining its chronology. As a rule they are as eager to reject Irenaeus' interpretation of this—after all the only straightforward interpretation—as they are to accept his evidence about the authorship of the Gospel in question.

Another point of interest in this tract is the passage, chapter ix., about the seven heavens, over each of which a special angel or spirit wields authority. The seven spirits are those enumerated in Isaiah xi. 2, of wisdom, understanding, counsel, might, knowledge, piety or reverence. The lowest firmament immediately over our heads "is full of the fear of this Spirit which illumines the heavens." For an account of the belief in seven heavens I may refer the reader to Dr. Charles' edition of the Slavonic Secrets of Enoch, and Cumont, *Religions orient.* 1907, p. 152.

It is interesting to note that in this tract, chapter iii., Irenaeus bases "baptism for remission of sins in (*or*, into) the name of God the Father and in the name of Jesus Christ,

Son of God made flesh, and who died and rose again, and into the Holy Spirit of God," not on the text Matthew xxviii. 19, but on the traditional faith handed down to him "by the elders, the disciples of the apostles." It may be inferred that he was, if not ignorant of the T.R. of Matthew xxviii. 19, at least temporarily forgetful of it. In the Latin version of the *Adv. haer.* the text is indeed cited in book iii. 18, 1; though it is there so incongruous with the context that I suspect the text Acts i. 5 to have originally been read. Unfortunately the Armenian version of the *Adv. haer.* discovered along with this hitherto lost tract, only comprises books iv. and v., and can therefore shed no light on this point. The circumstance, however, that in book iv., xii. (iv. 7) the newly recovered Armenian assigns the *Magnificat* to Elizabeth (as do the Clermont and Voss MSS. of the Latin) proves that some of the Latin codices have been overworked by a corrector. The passage in this new treatise is so important that I translate it integrally:

Now, inasmuch as faith is constitutive (= *συνέκτικος*) of our salvation, it is right and needful to exercise great solicitude for it, that we may have our apprehension of facts a true one. Now, faith assigns (*or* guarantees) us this just as the elders, the disciples of the Apostles, handed (it) down. In the first place it prescribes remembrance of the fact that we have received baptism for the remission of sin into name of God the Father and into name of Jesus Christ, the Son of God made flesh and dead and risen, and into Holy Spirit of God; and that this baptism is seal of eternal life and rebirth into God, so that we become sons, no longer of mortal men, but of the eternal and everlasting God.

Why should Irenaeus, if he had before him the direct precept of the Lord to baptize in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit (Matt. xxviii. 19), thus invoke the tradition of the elders? Why represent this baptism as received from them? For that is the force of the phrase *we have received*, answering, as it does, to *handed down* in the preceding sentence. I do not suggest that the

elders did not represent such baptism as instituted by Christ Himself. Of course they did. But I do maintain that it is one thing for Matthew the Apostle (who in Irenaeus' opinion penned the First Gospel) to have handed down the precept so to baptize, and quite another thing for elders who were but pupils of the disciples to have mediated the transmission, and to be the guarantors of its correctness. Moreover, the true formulae as here given is quite unlike that of Matthew xxviii. 19. There one and the same name includes Father, Son and Spirit. Here *name* is given before both Father and Son, but pointedly omitted before the Holy Spirit.

We welcome the promise of the Editor to publish before long a corpus of all the portions of Irenaeus which exist in Armenian, especially of the last two books of the *Adv. haer.* For the two older MSS. of the Latin version suffer from lacunas in the fifth book, and are also defective towards the end. Comparing the Armenian version of Irenaeus with other old Armenian versions, e.g. of Philo, Chrysostom, and the Bible, I have not the least doubt but that it belongs to the golden age of that literature, and is as old as A.D. 450. I cannot understand why the Editor sets it as late as 650 to 750. That the earliest citations of it occur in the Monophysite writers of that age is no proof that it was not made much earlier. Still less can I understand how he can for a minute doubt that a Greek original, rather than a Syriac one, underlies it. From beginning to end it shows none of the Syriasms so frequent in Armenian versions made from Syriac, such as those of the History of Eusebius and of the Homilies of Aphraat.

FRED C. CONYBEARE.

SYNOPTIC STUDIES.

II.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES AND THE SAYINGS OF JESUS.

IN my first Study—which untoward circumstances have separated from this by too wide a gulf—I used the Epistle of James as a document from which we could deduce valuable independent evidence as to the earliest form of sayings of Jesus. But if we are to rely on the Epistle in this way, we must clearly have some sort of a theory as to the date of its composition and its essential character. I deviate into what may seem like a by-path because I believe it is possible to suggest a theory which will meet the central difficulty of the Epistle and at the same time encourage us to use it as a prime authority for the Logia. Perhaps if the personal touch may be allowed, I am all the more ready to digress—if it be a digression—because the Epistle has always been to me no *epistola straminea*, but a golden book to which I have turned sooner than to any of the Epistles except perhaps *Philippians*, a book the quality of which has been approved not by weight of other people's judgements, but by the irresistible appeal of an authority within it which I at any rate find it impossible to gainsay.

The son of Joseph and Mary—for such I take the author to be, while necessarily avoiding a restatement of reasons for adopting this side—James avows himself the “slave” of God and the Lord Jesus Christ, whose human brother he was well known to be. But having thus declared himself, he drops all overt reference to Christian faith, and only names the Master in a verse where the forced order of the words raises an extremely strong presumption of a gloss. He seeks a supreme example of Endurance in Job, instead of bidding his readers “consider Him that hath endured

such gainsaying of sinners against themselves." And yet his short pages are simply studded with quotations from, and allusions to, the Words of Jesus, so that the theory that we have only a Jewish work, doctored in one or two passages, becomes positively grotesque. Into what age of Church history are we to put a book which presents such contradictions? We might naturally take refuge in the view, ably presented by Professor Currie Martin in a recent *EXPOSITOR*, that the Epistle shows us little about Christ just because it is almost made up of His own words. But if it was known to be a collection of Logia, how could it fail to be widely known and eagerly read from an early date? The long and doubtful fight it made for inclusion in the Canon is not easily explained on this hypothesis.

And yet I venture to believe that Mr. Martin has come nearer to the truth than most of his predecessors in this complex critical investigation. Has anyone yet proposed to regard the Epistle as addressed *by a Christian to Jews*? The "Twelve Tribes of the Dispersion," of course, most naturally suggest such a destination. The "synagogue" of ii. 2 will then be Jewish, and the rich men who are so sternly denounced will be more easily found than if we have to seek them in a Christian community of any date prior to the age of Constantine. Now of all the Christians of the first century, who are known to us, James is the only one who had in any sense the ear of the Jews. The well known story of Hegesippus, improbable enough in its main features, may fairly be trusted in its picture of a man whose loyalty to the Law and the Temple, sanctity of life and faithful adherence to the Jewish ideal of righteousness, had long commanded the reverence of fellow-countrymen bitterly hostile to Christians of the Pauline type. Is it not wholly in character that he should endeavour to

plead with his countrymen abroad, waking afresh the tones of ancient prophecy and ancient "Wisdom" alike, and weaving in a whole fabric of ethical teaching that had fallen from the lips of the supreme Prophet? To name Him would have been to frustrate his whole purpose. Others might argue His Messiahship by appealing to the Scriptures, and when Jews were as candid and open-minded as those of Beroea such a method would be abundantly fruitful. But a far larger number would be deaf to all argument which even named the Crucified, and he who would reach them must try another way. Could there be a better than to write as a Jew to Jews, threading the pearls of Christ's own teaching on a string of miscellaneous exhortation, all tending to shame them out of a blind unbelief rooted in party spirit (*ἐπιθεία*)? Jews who would read this Epistle could often without great difficulty be led on to read such a book as our First Gospel, in which they would learn with surprise that many of the sayings they had accepted as heavenly wisdom, when purporting to come from a pious and orthodox Jew, were really due to Him whom all orthodox Jews had agreed never to hear.

Of course this theory involves rejecting as early Christian glosses the two passages which do name the Lord Jesus. In the address we may assume the writer calls himself simply "James, bondservant of God." In ii. 1 the Greek becomes clear and normal when we read "Hold not the faith of the Lord of Glory with respect of persons": cf. Psalm xxix. 3, xxiv. 7—not exact parallels, but near enough to suggest to the Jewish reader a perfectly natural and to him unobjectionable meaning, while retaining for the author a veiled allusion to Jesus.

The subsequent fate of the Epistle seems to become very much clearer on this theory. Among the Jews its chance of success would be ultimately barred by its author's

martyrdom as a Christian at the hands of Jews.¹ Among the Christians it never had a chance of popularity. The absence of specifically Christian doctrine in it, and the presence of doctrine which to superficial readers looked like an attack on Paulinism, combined to prevent its being much read. It would owe its preservation to the small and diminishing circle of Palestinian Christians among whom the memory of James was cherished: to them would be due the addition of the missing words in i. 1 and ii. 1 which James had in his heart but forced his pen to omit. Gradually, as relics of the Apostolic Age grew rarer and rarer, this gem emerged from its obscurity, and what may well be the earliest writing of the New Testament took its rightful place in the Canon.²

Before proceeding to apply this theory to some important passages in the Epistle, let me give a modern parallel which is worth recounting for its own sake. A few years ago one of the most learned of our missionaries in India, the Rev. Benjamin Robinson, of the W.M.S., sent in a Kanarese tract to a Christian literature agency with a view to its publication. Its purpose was to awaken the activity of Conscience, as the inward witness of right and wrong, the very name for which, as used in Christian Indian literature, was supposed³ to be a coinage of the missionaries. It reproduced a story from the Mahābhārata. King Duṣyanta, hunting in a forest, fell in love with Çakuntalā, the adopted daughter of the hermit Kaṇva, and married her, with a pledge that

¹ Josephus, *Ant.* XX. ix. 1.

² I should note here that the first suggestion of this theory came to me from a question asked me in class by one of my students, Mr. Mountford. Mr. Robinson (see below) reminds one of a good parallel in what Schürer says (*Jewish People*, E.T., II. iii. 279 f.) about the Sibyllines and other "Jewish propaganda under a heathen mask."

³ Wrongly, as Mr. Robinson points out: the word (*manahsāksi*, lit. "mind-witness") occurs in a version of the Rāmāyaṇa by Pampa, a Kanarese poet, born 902 A.D.

her son should have his throne. He went home and forgot her. When the boy was twelve years old, Çakuntalā went at Kanva's bidding to the king's court to claim his promise. The king recognized her, but denied her and bade her begone. She said :¹

“I am alone,” thou deemest. . . .

Sinning, one thinks “None is aware of me,”

And the gods are aware of him, and the man within.

Sun and Moon, Fire and Wind,

Sky, Earth, Waters, Heart and Yama ;

Day too, and Night, and both Twilights,

And Dharma know the conduct of a man.

The subsequent history of Mr. Robinson's tract continues the parallel. One missionary to whom it was referred returned it with the comment that a Hindu might read it and worship in the nearest temple more devoutly than ever. Which was just what its author intended—a Hindu who had learnt from his own sacred books the idea of Conscience as the “inward man,” the witness of secret sin, was thereby nearer to the Kingdom of God and more accessible to the appeal of Christ. Happily the tract was published, and has its audience still. It is to be fervently hoped that the growth of the study of Comparative Religion will make Christian missionaries increasingly ready to adopt methods which were so conspicuously used by St. Paul—to bind up the bruised reed and fan to a flame the smouldering wick of pagan religion, assured that every glimmering light of Truth was kindled ultimately from Him who is the Light of the world and the only source of Truth. But this is by the way.

Let us now assume that the Epistle of James was a composition of this class, a Christian's appeal to non-Christians, which veils Christian terms and names in order to insinuate

¹ I give the passage as translated by a high authority, my friend Mr. F. W. Thomas, of the India Office Library.

Christian truth into prejudiced minds.¹ We will treat it as addressed to Jews of the Dispersion, though applicable in many ways to the conditions of Palestine, the author's home. At the outset we are confronted with social conditions which are natural enough in any Jewish community, but difficult to find among Christians during the ages of persecution. There is "the congregation of God's poor," oppressed by nominal co-religionists, to whom they are prone to show a grovelling deference whenever one of these plutocrats deigns to visit their synagogue. The teaching of Christ on the subject of riches and its possessors was wholly in the line of the ancient prophets' doctrine: respect of persons, the beatification of the proud and the wealthy, the lingering superstition that poverty and trial were proofs of Divine displeasure, all demanded readjusting to a right perspective by words of authority which set forth the will of Israel's God. For this and for the scathing of the wealthy tyrants who ground the faces of the poor while professing devotion to the Faith of Israel, there were sayings of Jesus in plenty ready to the hand of one who knew them well. James embedded them in kindred exhortations, drawn partly from Hebrew *hokhma*, and partly from the stores of a latter-day Amos whose indignation at social wrong had been kindled in the white flame of the wrath of Jesus towards everything that defied the "Royal Law."

"They say, and do not," was the burden of Christ's denunciation of the scribes. It could hardly be questioned that an enlargement on this theme would always be pecu-

¹ My friend Dr. A. S. Peake suggests a good parallel in Charles Reade's "It is Never Too Late to Mend." So in chap. xxxi:—"And then she secretly quoted the New Testament to him [the Jew Levi], having first ascertained that he had never read it; and he wondered where on earth this simple girl had picked up so deep a wisdom and so lofty and self-denying a morality." Cf. also pp. 236 f. (chapter xxxii.), "I will not tell you whence I had them," etc.

liarily appropriate before an audience of Jews. Keenly sensitive about orthodoxy, passionately dogmatic as to the monotheistic creed (ii. 19), which creed if a man held pure and undefiled, without doubt he should be saved everlastingly, the Jews assuredly needed the prophetic voice that told them a greater truth—that the hosts of hell were as orthodox as Jews ever could be, and that no orthodoxy was worth anything if it did not inspire a noble life.¹ How many Sayings of Jesus were used by James in enforcing this doctrine we cannot tell: we can recognize some clearly enough, and we know that in all the Master's teaching there was nothing so conspicuously reiterated as the great lesson of applied religion which closes the Sermon on the Mount. In driving home his antithesis of faith and works, James obviously means by faith not much more than mere belief.² Such a meaning was natural in

¹ This is quite consistent with the existence in Judaism of a strong tendency towards emphasizing "orthopraxy" beyond orthodoxy. Prof. Peake recalls what Mr. Herford says on this point in the introduction of his *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*. An observer of our present-day religious conditions might find abundant evidence for asserting that we lay all the stress on creed, or on practice: it would depend on the circles he happened to visit, or the books he happened to read. And even one and the same teacher, if his sayings were isolated, might easily be quoted for both sides: we all tend to exaggerate the particular side of the truth for which at any moment we are pleading. This obvious consideration should be borne in mind when we try to estimate the prevailing trend of doctrine in another age, which like our own was profoundly interested in religious theory and praxis.

² I guard this in deference to Prof. Peake, whose opinion on such matters has peculiar weight. It seems to me that the meaning of *πίστις* in ii. 14-26 is mainly conditioned by verse 19. But the natural Jewish exegesis of Gen. xv. 6 (verse 23) has to be allowed its influence. The citations in Lightfoot's excursus (*Galatians* 158 ff.) show that in purely Jewish circles *belief* often came to include very much of the meaning *trust*, and that the faith of Abraham was interpreted by Philo and others in a sense not differing widely from Paul's own. May we say then that James starts with the idea of credal orthodoxy, but that his sense of the necessary consequences of this forces into the word, before the paragraph concludes, a decidedly deeper meaning? It was still not a meaning which would be unfamiliar in the Jewish schools.

purely Jewish circles. How could it ever be natural among those whose whole thought was shaped by the words of Jesus, for whom "faith" meant a childlike trust in a heavenly Father, too wise to err and too good to be unkind? If the Epistle is a late Christian writing, it is an all but incredible reversion to a pre-Christian type. Make it early, and addressed to Jews, and we can see clearly how the Christian teacher used the name as it was used in his audience, but strove to add to the narrow conception what would enrich it infinitely. Faith, orthodoxy, when demonstrated by practical holiness which sprang from it (ii. 18), was a grace Paul could bless as warmly as James. The use of *πίστις* in Paul and *Hebrews* belongs palpably to a later stage of thought, bearing the unmistakable marks of Christ's teaching. For Priscilla—if she be the great unknown—the child's trust in the Father becomes "the title-deeds¹ of things hoped for," the promises of One so implicitly trusted being treated as realized assets instead of possible futures. For Paul it was the almighty touch of life which made him one with Christ, a perfect trust producing a perfect fellowship that nothing could break or mar. The word has gone far indeed from the stage in which it was capable of being conceived as a possession of the very demons!

"Saying and Doing" is in another form the theme of the third chapter. Even the Twelve had needed to be warned against the ambition to be "called Rabbi," so ingrained in a people whose admiration for their teachers had been largely responsible for making the Pharisees into the pretentious humbugs they most of them were. James's sermon on the Tongue is very obviously based on his Master's teaching. The study of his words makes

¹ See my note, *EXPOSITOR*, VI. viii. 439 (Dec. 1903).

us feel at once that the Jewish world of his time was far more in need of such a warning than the Christian community. *Odium theologicum* always burnt fiercely in Jewish air; and when there were Christians to curse, as well as Jews of other parties, we may feel that James's remonstrance was very much to the point. The εἰρηνοποιοί on whom he pronounces afresh the Master's benediction were not mere good-natured flabby people whose motto was "anything for a quiet life." "Make peace; pursue peace"—treat it as the first of all God's demands, and use all your powers to secure the prize—such is the message of Inspiration to Zealots of the old time and Jingoës of the new, to Jews cursing Christians in the first century and Christians cursing one another in the twentieth.

The very climax of impossibility seems to be reached when we try to apply the fourth chapter to a Christian community of any earlier date than the fourth century. "You covet and possess not—then you do murder. You envy and cannot attain—then you fight and war." Are we to water this down to metaphor? To treat φονεύετε thus is hard enough; and if ever the principle of the *difficilior lectio* applied, it surely steps in here to bar the obvious conjecture φθονεῖτε, introduced by Erasmus for the first time and followed by Luther. And the picture of prosperity and worldliness, love of pleasure and giddy selfishness, which prompts the prophet's mingled tenderness and severity, is extraordinarily incongruous if it belongs to a sect which was everywhere spoken against, membership of which might any day involve martyrdom. Christians of *this* stamp were surely the proud product of Constantine's well-meant revolution, and not of any earlier conditions. There are many passages on which we might dwell in discussing this view of the Epistle, but we will be content with one more, v. 6. Can we take this as an allusion to "the

Righteous One, of whom the Jews had become betrayers and murderers" ? In our theory, of course, this must not be more than a particular application—albeit supreme in the writer's own mind—of a general charge which had very often justified itself only too completely. The verse is the echo of Matthew xxiii. 35.

A word may be added in conclusion as to the objections which Harnack raises against Spitta's theory. It does not at all follow that they will hold against the rather similar but vitally different theory defended here. We no longer have to remark on the absence of Rabbinical conceits and puerilities : the absence of obtrusively Christian doctrine and of the lower forms of Judaism comes alike from our postulate. Among the passages which Harnack regards as difficult to refer to a Jewish document there do not seem to be any which refuse to suit the other view. In i. 18, 25, 27, ii. 12 we may readily agree that the language is improbable enough on the lips of a non-Christian Jew. But so long as it did not repel the Jewish reader by suggesting that the doctrine was positively heterodox, one sees no reason why James should not use such words. The Parousia of the Judge in v. 7 ff. is a little more difficult. But the thought does not go one whit beyond what Amos had said centuries before. "Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel," is reiterated here with solemn emphasis ; and if the writer himself believes that Jehovah is coming in His Son, his language is absolutely capable of the Jewish connotation. Nor is Parousia a technical Christian term. The Petrie papyri have shown us that it was used two or three centuries earlier—without epithet or even article—as a sufficient expression for a *royal visit* ; and it is likely enough that a word suggesting such an idea would be used in Jewish circles to describe the "day of the Lord" for which the prophets had prepared them. And even if the

word had never actually been thus used, its application would cause no surprise. There remains one more difficulty, the use of *πίστις* in i. 3, "recognizing that what is genuine in your belief works out endurance." It does not seem necessary to assume here that the Jewish reader would see anything strange. True belief, a holding of the Creed of Israel as no mere formality, but a possession dearer than life, had worked out endurance of a very wonderful kind in the days of the Maccabees. See further above.

Our next task will be to see what form the Sayings of Jesus had in the source, written or oral, which was used by James.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

WELLHAUSEN ON THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

WELLHAUSEN has not yet followed up his edition of the synoptic gospels with a similar volume on the fourth, but in the meantime he has published a minor contribution in the shape of a small shilling pamphlet upon a single aspect of its literary criticism. This essay, entitled *Erweiterungen und Aenderungen im vierten Evangelium* (Berlin, 1907), is characteristically independent. Its subject has been discussed for some time, even in his own country, and contributions have been made at various angles of the problem, but of these Wellhausen chooses to remain serenely oblivious. Blass is the only critic whose emendations of the text he notices. He goes his own way, looks at things with his own eyes, and summarily pronounces judgment as if he were the first to sit upon the critical bench. This method has its merits. The criticism is devoid of echoes; it rings fresh and original. But one disadvantage is that more than once the bearings of some problem have been already carefully taken, so that the student finds several of Wellhausen's arguments answered beforehand, while he misses any estimate of some points which have been previously raised. It is all to the good, however, that Wellhausen has drawn attention to the literary criticism of the Fourth Gospel, and especially that he has refused to follow the lead of Jülicher and H. J. Holtzmann. These powerful scholars, the former in his *Introduction to the New Testament* (6th ed. 1906, pp. 351 f.) and the latter in an essay in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wissenschaft* (1902, 50-60), flatly refuse to admit the presence of interpolations or transpositions in the Fourth Gospel, with the exception, of course, of such well-known passages as v. 3b-4, vii. 53-viii. 11, where the textual evidence is conclusive. Well-

hausen's interest in the problem seems to have been started by some of Jülicher's remarks. But fortunately he disagrees with the Marburg New Testament expert, and, whatever may be thought of his own particular theories, it is welcome to find that he is no supporter of the "mailed fist" order of criticism which would rule out all interpolation theories and bang the door upon any attempt to analyse and rearrange the literary strata of the Fourth Gospel.

The pamphlet is far from exhaustive. No attention, e.g., is paid to the question of Tatian's *Diatessaron* in its bearings upon the general problem, nor is any notice taken of the position of vii. 15-24, x. 26 f., and xii. 44 f., while even the difficulties of i. 15 and similar verses do not seem to have attracted the author's attention. Thus Kuinoel's transposition of xiii. 20 to a position after verse 16 is unnoticed. The choice of passages for discussion is curiously arbitrary, and Wellhausen assumes, instead of illustrating from outside sources, the possibility of transpositions, expansions, and interpolations in ancient literature. A few paragraphs on this topic might not have been out of place, for many readers still need to be orientated in this matter. The well-known case of Ribbeck's theory about Vergil is a warning that all hypotheses of displacement require to be checked by a wise hesitation in attributing too exact and systematic ¹ a character to any ancient document, whether in poetry or in history; yet it may be pointed out, in passing, that Vergil himself offers instances of undoubted displacement (cf. e.g. *Georgics*, iv. 203 f.), as does Aeschylus

¹ Thus the rearrangement of John iv. 6-9 in the Sinaitic Syriac version is pronounced by Dr. Abbott to be "chronological but not Johannine. John does not accumulate his descriptions of scenery and circumstances at the beginning of a scene as in a stage direction, but prefers to give them in parentheses, each in its turn as it is wanted" (*Johannine Grammar*, 2632). Unevenness is not to be assumed as essentially un-Johannine, but neither, on the other hand, is it legitimate to postulate it as an invariable characteristic of the Gospel.

(cf. *Choephorae*, 997 f.), and Bernays has shown pretty clearly that the original order of Philo's *περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου* has got disarranged during the transmission of the extant text. The anti-sigma of Aristarchus has a rôle outside the pages of Homer. Besides, there is always the possibility that the author of the Fourth Gospel may have himself revised and enlarged his work, so that what we now possess is practically a second draft or edition, bearing marks of its literary evolution. But even this theory, though advocated forcibly some years ago by Becker (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1889, pp. 117 f.) and still applied by several critics to the problem of chapter xxi., is ignored practically by Wellhausen; he prefers the hypothesis of the original Gospel having received enlargement and interpolation from the hand of a later editor who, though belonging to the Johannine circle, did not occupy exactly the theological position of the author.

Some of the minor interpolations do not deserve much consideration. Missing the case for the interpolation of the gloss, *ὑδατος καὶ* in iii. 5, Wellhausen declares that iv. 2 ("Jesus did not himself baptize, it was his disciples") is a "protestatio facto contraria," inserted in order to remove the discrepancy between the Fourth Gospel and the synoptic tradition. But, had this been in the redactor's mind, he could much more easily have reached his end by simply deleting *καὶ βαπτίζει* in verse 1. To omit also the difficult verse 44 ("for Jesus himself testified that a prophet has no honour in his own country") of the same chapter as an unauthentic¹ interpolation (p. 33), is hardly of much use, unless some reasonable explanation can be given of how it ever came to be inserted in its present position; and Wellhausen has none to offer. Similarly, a

¹ Hugo Delff had already deleted it as one of many editorial interpolations.

closer study of the Johannine method of connecting clauses and sentences (see Abbott's *Johannine Grammar*, 2470, 2636) shows that it is needless to take the parenthetical vi. 64*b* as an interpolation (p. 34), and the characteristic play upon the double sense of the word renders it unlikely that ἡ θύρα in x. 7 is a mistake¹ for ὁ ποιμὴν (so Blass), and x. 9 an explanatory gloss (pp. 34–35), just as it is only the *a priori* assumption that the same author could not have given different settings to the same saying which justifies Wellhausen (p. 36) in deleting xviii. 9 as a gloss (cf. xvii. 12)—a suggestion which he does not seem to realize was made long ago by Scholten and Bakhuyzen. Furthermore, it is prosaic to delete xviii. 32 on the ground that nothing has hitherto been said about any definite method of death (pp. 36–37); the context, sketched with characteristic allusiveness, is enough to show that the crucifixion, which was the divinely appointed method of Christ's death, could only be inflicted on him if he passed from the hands of the Jews into those of the Romans. And, finally, the allusion to the hands and feet of Jesus in xx. 20 is not "ganz unmotivirt" (p. 27); the author is here working up, as is often the case, the material of the Lucan tradition (cf. Luke xxiv. 39). Nor does xx. 19–23 give one the impression of being the natural climax of the Gospel. Surely xx. 24–29 is the finale.² It is improbable, therefore, that xx. 20 (καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτῆς) and 24–29 are to be regarded as later interpolations

¹ The tradition, if not the text, of John was evidently familiar to Ignatius (*ad Philad.* ix.), who describes Christ as θύρα τοῦ πατρός, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία.

² In *New Testament Autographs* (pp. 14 f.) Prof. Rendel Harris once suggested that xx. 30–31 should be placed after xxi. 24, on the ground that verse 30 (like 2 John 12, 3 John 13) implies an insufficiency of writing material at the author's disposal; but this involves the hazardous substitution of αὐτοῦ for τῶν μαθητῶν.

(p. 27). The author of the Gospel does not enter into the reasons for the absence of Thomas, nor does he stop to explain how apparently he did not receive the Holy Spirit. To make the latter difficulty a reason for suspecting the authenticity of the passage is to miss the method and aim of the Evangelist. "Dans l'économie de l'enseignement johannique, c'est un hasard providentiel, qui provoque une seconde apparition du Sauveur; au point de vue de la rédaction, c'est le moyen d'amener une dernière et importante leçon, avec la profession de foi qui élôt dignement tant le livre" (Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, p. 917). Certainly, anyone who hailed Jesus as Lord (xx. 28) would naturally be taken to possess the Holy Spirit (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3).

On some larger passages the discussion is more adequate, however, and to these we must now turn.

The transposition of chapters v. and vi. is no novelty in the criticism of the Fourth Gospel.¹ As far back as the fourteenth century a certain Ludolphus de Saxonia, in his *Vita Christi evangelicis et scriptoribus orthodoxis excerpta* is said to have suggested it, while J. P. Norris, in *The Journal of Philology* for 1871 (pp. 107-112), states the evidence pretty fully. Chapter v. has for its nucleus a Jerusalem-incident, and closes without any hint, such as is given in iv. 43, 46, that the scene has changed. Yet chapter vi. assumes that Jesus is in Galilee. "After these things Jesus went away to the opposite side of the sea of Galilee" (v. 1), as if he and the crowd had been, not in Jerusalem, but on the Capernahum side of the lake (cf. 22, 59). Now, if the original order be taken to have been iv., vi., v., and vii., the awkward geographical transition is smoothed out, iv. and vi. describing Jesus in Galilee,

¹ On the internal criticism of these chapters see Wendt's *das Johannes-Evangelium* (1900), pp. 68 f., Eng. Trans. (1902), pp. 75 f.

v. narrating a visit to Jerusalem on the occasion of a feast, while vii. opens with Jesus again in Galilee, not in Judaea any longer, "because the Jews were seeking to kill Him" (v. 1). The last touch plainly comes more aptly after the similar allusions in v. 16 and 18, than after vi., which is silent upon any murderous aims of the Jews. And this connexion is particularly good if, with an increasing number of critics,¹ we agree to place vii. 15-24 after v. 47, for vii. 1 would then echo vii. 20-21. Wellhausen misses this corroboration entirely. Indeed his pages on the present transposition add nothing to the arguments already advanced, except an ingenious suggestion to account for the shifting of chapter vi. It was due, he argues, to a sense of chronological discrepancy. In v. 1 ("after this there was a festival of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem") the allusion to the Passover was unmistakable in the light of the preceding vi. 4 ("Now the passover, the festival of the Jews, was at hand").² Thus three Passovers would be necessary for the life of Jesus. But the desire to harmonize the synoptic chronology, with its single Passover, and the Johannine led to a transposition of chapter v. and chapter vi., leaving it an open question whether the feast of v. 1 was a passover or not, and permitting the two remaining passovers of the Fourth Gospel to be taken as the termini of Christ's single-year ministry, since that of vi. 4 is the last Passover.³ This is, at first sight, an attractive theory. Only, it would surely have been easier for the redactor or editor to omit vi. 4 entirely. Wellhausen has

¹ See *The Historical New Testament*, pp. 690-691, and Loisy's edition of the Fourth Gospel (pp. 147-148), with Prof. E. D. Burton's arguments in *The Biblical World* (1899), pp. 16-41, where the true order is given as vi. 1-71, v. 1-47, vii. 15-24, 1-14, 25f.

² On Hort's suggestion, after Voss, Jacobsen, and others, that τὸ πᾶσχα here is an interpolation, see Prof. Burkitt's criticism in *Evang. da-Mepharr.* ii. 313.

³ Cf. Briggs, *New Light upon the Life of Jesus* (1904), pp. 50 f.

not met this objection fairly, and it remains a serious obstacle to the acceptance of his view. Bakhuyzen, the Dutch critic, omits it entirely as a gloss, while Dr. Briggs (*op. cit.* p. 153) considers that the whole chapter has been unchronologically displaced from its real position after chapter xi. But these suggestions are trenchant rather than convincing. Even Tatian's order cannot be relied upon implicitly as a witness to some superior tradition. For the hypothesis¹ that the Tatianic arrangement reflects the original order followed in the autograph of the Fourth Gospel would imply that the Diatessaron follows the general outline of that Gospel, whereas the feasts are really re-arranged (cf. Mr. Hobson's excellent statement in *The Diatessaron of Tatian and the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 33 f.); it would also involve the freedom of the Tatianic order from the abruptnesses which are occasionally visible in the canonical text, whereas, on the other hand, iv. 45b forms but a poor bridge between v. 47 and vii. 1, while, e.g., vi. 71 is hardly a natural prelude to iv. 4.

In viii. 44 Wellhausen (pp. 19-24) would read, with Aphraates, "ye are of Cain," not of the devil, the point being that as Cain sought to slay his brother who pleased God, so the Jews, by their murderous mind against Jesus (v. 18), betrayed their real affinity not with Abraham but with Cain. To carry out this rendering, he is obliged to regard the words, "For there is no truth in him. When he tells a lie he speaks of his own," as an editorial interpolation by a redactor, possibly the author of the first epistle (cf. iii. 8-12), who first changed "Cain" into "the devil." This is a plausible suggestion in itself, and the reading of Syr-Sin (*πονηροῦ* for *διαβόλου*) tells in its favour, *πονηροῦ* possibly being an echo of Aphraates' reading. What makes one

¹ Defended by Prof. Bacon in *The American Journal of Theology* (1900), pp. 770-795.

hesitate to accept the theory is the context. In the first epistle of John, Abraham is not in view, and the allusion to Cain and Abel, as symbolized in the later Jewish tradition which Philo has expounded, is in harmony with the author's stress upon brotherly love. In the Gospel, on the other hand, Abraham, as the spiritual father of true believers, is everywhere in evidence (cf. viii. 37 f., "I know you are Abraham's offspring, yet you seek to kill me . . . you do your father's deeds," i.e. the devil's), down to verse 53 f. of this chapter. It would be abrupt, therefore, to introduce a reference to Cain in the heart of all this Abrahamic argument, unless the passage in question absolutely demanded it. Nor can it be said that it does; for the rendering, "he is a liar and the father of the liar," or "of falsehood,"¹ is by no means so untenable as Wellhausen alleges,² and, *per contra*, the description "a murderer from the beginning" is as applicable to the death brought on Adam through the devil's temptation as to Abel's murder.

The awkwardness of the long interval between xiv. 31 and xviii. 1 has also been felt by many critics, some of whom have proposed to place xv.-xvi. in their original position previous to xiv. 31, i.e. either between verses 20 and 21 of chapter xiii. (so Professor Bacon), or after xiii. 31a (Spitta), or finally between verses 35 and 36 of that chapter. It is immaterial for our present purpose to discuss the rival merits of these constructions, the second of which is adopted in the present writer's *Historical New Testament* (pp. 522 f., 692 f.), where the re-arranged text

¹ Dr. Abbott, who, like Réville and other modern critics, prefers the neuter rendering, suggests that to speak ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων means "out of them, i.e. his family," either through his own agents and organs or out of his own inner nature (*Johannine Grammar*, 2378, 2728).

² He also finds x. 16 an interruption to the context, but the real difficulty in this chapter is the intercalation of verses 22-25, on which see Prof. Burton's article and Prof. Bacon's remarks in *The American Journal of Theology* (1900), pp. 790 f.

may be seen, together with a summary of the evidence. The point is, that Wellhausen, who has rightly caught the intimate connexion between xiv. 31 and xviii. 1 (Jesus rising to his feet and in that attitude of prayer uttering the petitions of xvii.), takes his courage in his hands and proceeds to rule out xv.–xvii. as not merely misplaced but due to a redactor's hand (pp. 7–15).¹ This redactor, it is argued, had two aims in view. He wished to make the Paraclete's mission dependent on Christ (xv. 26, xvi. 7) as well as on the Father (xiv. 16, 26), and he desired to bring out the early Christian doctrine of the Second Advent, which chapter xiv. ignored. In that chapter the gift and the presence of the Paraclete with the community of Christ's people on earth render a second coming of the Lord superfluous. Whereas the redactor, in xv.–xvii. of the Gospel, like the author of the first epistle, brings out the doctrine of the second coming of Christ in a way which throws the Paraclete into a less central position. Furthermore, specific notes of this redactor are to be found in his conception of joy (*χαρά*) as the supreme religious boon, and of the world (*ὁ κόσμος*) as the supreme foe of the Christians, instead of, as elsewhere in the gospel, *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*. Such considerations, Wellhausen concludes, "show that one is not making a great hole in the Fourth Gospel (by eliminating xv.–xvii.), but taking a beam out of its eye. The author of the Gospel is vastly superior to the editor in austerity of tone and in freedom of movement—for truly it was no trifle to advance beyond faith in the parousia."

The evidence for the later origin of xv.–xvii. is, however,

¹ A preliminary objection to any such theory may be tabled, on the ground that it would break up the symmetry of size which prevails throughout the gospel. Its three portions i.–vi., vii.–xii., and xiii.–xx., are of fairly equal dimensions, and while this is not seriously interfered with by the re-arrangement of chapters v.–vii., it would be materially affected by Wellhausen's theory of xv.–xvii.

unequal in parts and inconclusive on the whole. For one thing, the discrepancies between these chapters and the rest of the Gospel are not so decisive as Wellhausen would make out. Thus the second coming is not absent from chapter xiv., for the third verse of that chapter begins : *ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἐτοιμάσω τόπον ὑμῖν, πάλιν ἔρχομαι*, while verse 18 closes with the promise, *ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, and the mere absence of these words in the Syriac is not justification enough for their deletion. Nor is persecution at the hands of the Jews entirely absent from the perspective of xv.-xvii. (cf. xvi. 2-3). And as for the doctrine of the Holy Spirit being different in xv.-xvii. from what it is in the rest of the Gospel, it is enough to point out that the same discrepancy (?) occurs within the Gospel itself (cf. xiv. 26 with xx. 22-23).¹ The unique emphasis on "joy" in these chapters is simply due to the change of scene. Jesus is no longer dealing with the outside world but with the inner circle of His disciples ; a fresh and more intimate atmosphere breathes inevitably through the conversation, and the emergence of such a phase of personal religion is no more surprising than the cessation of all allusions to such categories as that of "light," which prevailed throughout the earlier discourses.

It is with real interest that one passes on to Wellhausen's pages upon the difficulties of the eighteenth chapter. Here the hypothesis of dislocation has been worked out variously (see *The Historical New Testament*, pp. 528-529, 693-694), as due either to editorial manipulation or to the blunders

¹ Wellhausen indeed denies that the Holy Spirit in the latter passage is the Paraclete, since the latter is conceived as a hypostasis. But this is futile. The passage in question is the equivalent, in the Fourth Gospel, for the Pentecost of the earlier tradition, the author's aim being to link the gift of the spirit more closely than before with the risen person of Jesus. Besides, even in xv.-xvii., the conception of the Spirit does not correspond with that of the First Epistle (see on this Mr. E. F. Scott's *The Fourth Gospel*, 1906, pp. 340 f.).

of a copyist, though Wellhausen, as usual, ignores the reconstructions. He prefers to delete verse 24 entirely, instead of, with many critics (following Syr-Sin), regarding it as displaced from the end of verse 13 or even verse 14; and this carries with it the omission of ἀπο τοῦ Καϊαφᾶ in verse 28, and πρῶτον in verse 13, with ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου. The entire trial is thus supposed, in the original autograph of the Gospel, to have taken place before Annas, not Caiaphas, while the object of the redactor's interpolations would seem to have been the partial harmonizing of the Fourth Gospel with the synoptic narratives. Even if the latter motive is to be assumed, however, it does not exclude the hypothesis of the canonical text having become disordered,¹ and disarrangement, rather than interpolation, seems the more probable clue, especially as Syr-Sin already evinces traces of the original order of the passage (cf. Mrs. Lewis in *Expository Times*, xii. 518-519). One piece of corroborative evidence must now be given up, however. In the *Journal of Theological Studies* (ii. pp. 141-142), Mr. C. H. Turner pointed out that the excellent Old Latin codex *e* had a leaf excised between verses 12 and 25 of chapter xviii., the presumption being that it was omitted because it contained the unfamiliar sequence of Syr-Sin. But, as Professor Burkitt has shown (*Evang. da-Mepharreshe*, ii. 316), this is unlikely, as most of the Latin texts, including *e*, have *ad Caipham* for *a Caipha* in verse 28, implying that the examination

¹ So Loisy: "L'hypothèse d'une confusion accidentelle, causée par la disposition matérielle du texte dans un manuscrit typique, à une époque très rapprochée des origines, paraît la plus vraisemblable; mais elle n'exclut pas, pour la formation du texte actuel, le souci de la conciliation avec les Synoptiques" (p. 831). Loisy (see further his *Études Bibliques*, 1901, pp. 142 f.), like Blass and Prof. Bacon, prefers the order of Syr-Sin, i.e. 13, 24, 14-15, 19-23, 16-18, 25b, 28, but Spitta's theory, as modified by Prof. G. G. Findlay (i.e. 13-14, 19-24, 15-18, 25b-28), still seems to me more likely, despite the criticisms of Schmiedel (*Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 4580 f.) and Holtzmann (*op. cit.* pp. 56 f.).

was conducted by Annas and not, as in Syr-Sin, by Caiaphas.

Finally, Wellhausen (pp. 27 f.) proposes to delete xix. 37 as un-Johannine in style and contents, with which verses 34-35 would also fall, i.e. the entire incident of the piercing of Christ's body with the lance (so previously Hugo Delff). The linguistic evidence does not amount to much. It is true that *ἕτερος* does not occur elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel, but this would be no decisive reason for pronouncing it un-Johannine,¹ unless a hapax legomenon is to be regarded as intrinsically unauthentic; nor, for the matter of that, does it occur in the First Epistle of John, whose author (cf. v. 6-7) Wellhausen has no hesitation in connecting with the interpolation! If the one could use this unique expression (*καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρα γραφὴ λέγει*), why not the other? The argument from the contents of the suspected passages is not more convincing. Even granting that the water and the blood are meant as mystical symbols of baptism and the Lord's Supper, it is not true to say that the Fourth Gospel ignores the latter entirely, for the references to the "blood" in vi. 53-56 plainly imply that the sacrament was present to the mind of the Evangelist, and it is arbitrary to rule out (pp. 28-29) these references as unauthentic interpolations. The assertion of 1 John v. 6-7 that Jesus Christ came not with water only but with water and blood is regarded by Wellhausen as a later protest against the ignoring of the blood in the Fourth Gospel, the writer of the epistle perhaps being responsible for the introduction of allusions to the latter in vi. 53-56 and xix. 34. This strikes one as a rather artificial and unnecessary construction.

¹ See Dr. Abbott's invaluable *Johannine Grammar* (2675-2677) on this point, and also (2317-2318) for the sense of verse 37. The connexion between xix. 35 f. and vii. 35 f. is excellently brought out by Grill in a note on p. 16 of his *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums* (1902).

What the Gospel and the First Epistle¹ together controvert in these passages, is the undue emphasis laid not only by docetics like Cerinthus, but by the school of John the Baptist upon the baptism of Jesus by water. His death also, it is insisted, is needful to the true estimate of his person and work. He came not by water only, but by water and blood, and the witness to this historic reality is His Spirit in the church (1 John v. 7); the witness is not merely some past historic testimony (John xix. 35), but the Spirit of the Crucified in the believer; and that, again, is not separable from the historic personality, for "the spirit and the water and the blood εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν." Nothing is really gained by Wellhausen's interpolation theory, in the way of "throwing an unbroken light on the truth that Jesus was the true Paschal Lamb" (p. 30). For, as Baur showed long ago, the incident of the piercing is needed to bring out this truth in its full bearings. "The supreme significance of the crisis of the death of Jesus is found in the fact that blood and water flowed from his wounded side. The reason why blood and water flowed from his side was that his side was pierced, and it was pierced because piercing was substituted for the breaking of the bones. . . . The water and blood which flowed from the side of Jesus as the true Paschal Lamb is the symbol of the spiritual life which through the death of Jesus is communicated in all its fulness to mankind" (*Church History*, Eng. Trans. ii. p. 159). This is excellently put, and it serves to show that the aim attributed by Wellhausen to the Fourth Evangelist is clearer when the verses in question are retained than when they are removed as a later interpolation.

Upon the whole, then, the results of the pamphlet are inconclusive. This is perhaps due to the fact that the author

¹ The latter being probably a comment upon the tradition of the former at this point (cf. J. Reville, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, pp. 57, 279 f.).

has hardly done justice to his case. He has not given any indication of his general views upon the purpose and character of the Gospel as a whole, and it is quite possible that some of his arguments would acquire more body if they were set in a reasoned framework of opinion upon the characteristics and origin of John's Gospel. The sole clue to Wellhausen's judgment upon the literary problem of the book is that he evidently associates the various interpolations and additions very closely with the author of the First Epistle, though he lays no stress upon the identification of the latter with the unknown Hellenist who, in his judgment, edited the Gospel. This hint is significant, if for no other reason than that it reveals Wellhausen in the ranks of those critics who feel that the First Epistle has characteristics sufficient to differentiate it from the Fourth Gospel in point of authorship. Curiously enough, Von Dobschütz has just begun a series of studies on the Epistle, which are designed to show that it also is of composite origin (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1907, pp. 1-8), but his arguments have not as yet connected the process with the Fourth Gospel. Taken together with Wellhausen's allusions, they suggest the pressing need of a fresh examination, not only into the literary relations of the First Epistle and the Fourth Gospel, but also into the religious ideas of the former.

JAMES MOFFATT.

MR. WILLIAM KELLY AS A THEOLOGIAN.

THE death of Mr. William Kelly has removed the last theologian who could be reckoned amongst either the makers or accredited exponents of the theological system best described as Darbyism. The system is one that exercised fifty years ago quite an extraordinary force of attraction and repulsion, and the moment seems opportune for presenting a summary account of it in the form it assumed under the hand of Mr. Kelly, who was unquestionably its most learned, systematic and lucid representative.

It is implied that Mr. Kelly was essentially the interpreter of Mr. Darby, and he himself would assuredly have desired no higher honour ; but Darbyism, apart from Mr. Kelly's interpretation, would have remained dumb to the whole circle of the uninitiated. Elucidated by him, it becomes readily amenable to scientific treatment ; but the honours, whatever they may amount to, of origination in the strict sense belong to Mr. Darby. "As abruptly and brokenly as sometimes his sentences would fall from him about divine things," says William Penn of his master Fox, "it is well known they were often as texts to many fairer declarations." This defines Mr. Kelly's position. He was Barclay to Mr. Darby's Fox. But that relation suggests that his function was almost indispensable.

In most periods of restless life in the Church, chiliasm has been a stirring element ; but in the case of the movement with which Mr. Kelly became identified, chiliasm actually gave birth to a widely extended and very vigorous community that existed in great part as its organ. This fact gives to the theological system he represents its unique place in the very wide and complex chiliastic movement of the nineteenth century.

Chiliasm found a congenial ally in an intense anti-Erastian

sentiment that produced a peculiar modification of High Church theory. In speaking of Mr. Kelly as a theologian, it is almost inevitable that we should begin with *ecclesiology*; and within that domain, his most distinctive and radical principle—a principle adopted by no other communion than the Brethren, and avowed in terms by hardly any Christian outside their ranks—is *the ruin of the Church*. The origin of this doctrine must be sought in Mr. Darby's youthful position as an ardent High Anglican. He was deeply impressed with the necessity for a visible organized unity; but he could not rest in the fiction that Episcopal Christianity fulfilled the essential condition. Ruling out the non-episcopal bodies did not touch the difficulty; the rents that were left behind were quite as glaring and as hopeless as those that were removed. It remained, therefore, that the Church was ruined; it had "entirely lost its original and essential standing." And God would not again set up that which had broken down. "The resource of the faithful in the ruins of Christendom," to use Mr. Kelly's own expression, was to be found in Matthew xviii. 20. The Lord would always be in the midst of two or three who met in His Name, and His Presence involved the fulness of blessing to those who counted upon Him. Organization was at an end. The Church of God could hope for no corporate witness to Christ, but faithful souls would not be deserted. It is obvious that such a view could never have existed apart from the feeling that the Second Advent was at hand to put a term to the present confusion and consequent impotence. The same text has been pleaded as the warrant of the congregational polity, but the standpoint occupied by Mr. Kelly was totally different. Polity was at an end, and the promise of Christ was the solitary boat saved from the sinking ship; but it would suffice to bring the crew to land. The history of the ruthless ecclesiastical administra-

tion of Darbyism is a melancholy satire upon the practicality of the theory with which it started.

The original community of the Brethren—and Mr. Kelly became associated with them before their earliest disruption—was therefore not a church.¹ It was not even a society with a defined membership. All Christians were Brethren; and if they were known to be Christians, they could take their place, of right and not of favour, wherever the “two or three” assembled. Any new comer, or any occasional visitor, to their meetings, if they judged him a Christian, shared with them, as a matter of indisputable prerogative, all their privileges and all their rights. They acknowledged in theory no fellowship and no membership except those of the Body of Christ. A simple corollary is that when, for presumed heresy or for misconduct, any person habitually communicating with them was “put away,” he was cast forth, not from the society of the Brethren (for no such thing was reckoned to exist), but from “the Church of God on earth.” Nor did Mr. Kelly and his friends hesitate to adopt the corollary. As a matter of fact, practice diverged so startlingly from theory that a few little companies professing these principles, and having therefore (apart from their common Christianity) no ostensible bond of union, either one with another or each in itself, developed into the most inelastic of all ecclesiastical organizations. The gulf between the theory and the practice was bridged of course by a series of legal fictions which it would be out of place to examine.² What has been said is essential, however, to the exhibition of Mr.

¹ “It is not our duty—far from it—to form a new church, but to cleave to that which is the oldest of all, and the only Church that is true—the assembly of God as it is exhibited in Scripture.”—Kelly, *Lectures on the Church of God*, p. 106.

² I have discussed the whole question in the *History of the Plymouth Brethren*, especially in chapter x.

Kelly's fundamental standpoint. His theology, like that of all his school, started from what he deemed a correct view of the Church ; and this in turn was bound up with a correct view of unfulfilled prophecy, of which something will be said below.

To the question what the Church essentially is, Mr. Kelly returned an answer that would generally be considered inconsistent with the dogma of its ruin. He utterly rejected all thought of a Church before Pentecost. The idea of a continuity between the Jewish and the Christian Churches, or indeed of a Jewish Church at all, was peremptorily rejected. Equally was the notion ruled out of a Church gathered round Christ in the days of His flesh, or receiving His instructions after the Resurrection. The descent of the Holy Ghost to indwell for the first time a company of men on earth constituted the Church of God. "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body." "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." But Mr. Kelly did not draw the inference that the Church is therefore indestructible, for he did not exactly hold that the aggregate of those thus indwelt do, by the invisible bond of that Divine indwelling, constitute the Church. Personally they constitute it, no doubt ; that is to say, they make up its *personnel*. But the outward union, which is essential, may be (and unhappily is) lacking : therefore, we have nothing left but a ruin. Such, at least, is the way in which I understand Mr. Kelly. "What people think and talk about as the 'invisible Church'—though scripture never uses the expression—was substantially in existence before 'the Church' ; and, in fact, this invisible state of things is what the Lord was putting an end to when He formed the Church . . . There was no such thing as 'the Church'—no gathering together of the scattered believers into one, till the death of Christ. The children of God had been scattered abroad,

but then they were gathered together. Henceforth disciples in Israel were not only destined to salvation, but they were gathered into one upon the earth. This is the Church. The assembly necessarily supposes the gathering of the saints into one body, separate from the rest of mankind. There was no such body before. Hence, to talk of 'the Church' in Jewish times, or in earlier days, is altogether a mistake. The mixture of believers with their unbelieving countrymen (i.e. what is called 'the invisible church') was the very thing which the Lord was concluding—not beginning—when He 'added to the Church daily such as should be saved.' The common error upon this subject is, that the aggregate of those that are to be saved composes the Church." (*Lectures on the Church of God*, p. 82.)

It may be added, however, that Mr. Kelly goes a long way towards reinstating the distinction he so disliked between the visible Church and the invisible, by the view he held, in common with Mr. Darby, as to the meaning of *the Kingdom of Heaven* in respect of its present manifestation: "The kingdom of heaven is not the same thing as the Church, but is rather the scene where the authority of Christ is owned, at least outwardly. . . . Every professing Christian . . . is in the kingdom of heaven. Every person who has, even in an external rite,¹ confessed Christ is not a mere Jew or Gentile, but in the kingdom. It is a very different thing from a man's being born again. . . . Whoso bears the name of Christ belongs to the kingdom of heaven. It may be that he is only a tare there, but still there he is." (*Lectures on Matthew*, p. 280.)

In respect of ministry, whether within the Church or

¹ This clause was apparently designed to bring persons baptized in infancy within the kingdom. This would be of the nature of a concession to Mr. Darby, for Mr. Kelly was a convinced Baptist, though he gave no prominence to his views.

proceeding from it (i.e. mission work), the theology of Mr. Kelly and his school did not widely differ from that of the Society of Friends. It is true that the Brethren were much more careful than the Friends to disclaim inspiration in days when the inspired was not regarded as shading off into the uninspired, but as separated from it by a gulf such as divides between different genera. And this is easily explained by the intense Biblicalism which amongst the Brethren occupied the place of the inner light of the Friends. It may be observed that Mr. Kelly's references to Quakers are generally unfriendly and disparaging. He was not the man to be deceived by merely superficial resemblances, or by resemblances which, though not superficial, yet afforded no counterpoise to grave differences that were strictly fundamental. Still, on the subject of ministry his divergence from them was for the most part terminological. In his view, all other communities (except, I presume, the Friends) stood condemned—to the extent that separation from them was imperative—by the absence of liberty for the Holy Ghost to minister to the needs of the Church by whomsoever He would. “ All I stand to now is, that the free action of the Spirit, among the gathered members of Christ, is the one principle of the assembly of God laid down in His word. There can be no other that He sanctions. . . . Let me ask . . . what you did last Lord's Day. Did the various members of the body come together trusting to the Holy Ghost to guide them, with an open door for this or that believer, as each had received the gift, to minister the same one to another, as good stewards of God's manifold grace ? ” (*Lectures on the Church*, p. 107.) One characteristic difference there was between Brethren and Friends. The Friends, carrying their principle out unflinchingly, recognized the ministry of women. The Brethren, out of deference to a positive Biblical injunction, as they supposed, forbade it.

In respect of ministry apart from church worship, there is the same substantial coincidence with Quakerism. "Juts as the Church is a divine thing, so is ministry. It flows neither from the believer nor from the Church, but from Christ, by the power of the Spirit. The *Lord* calls, not the church ; the *Lord* sends, not the saints ; the *Lord* controls, not the assembly. I speak now of the ministry of the word. There are certain functionaries whom the Church does or may choose : for instance, the assembly may nominate the persons it thinks fit to take care of the funds, and to distribute of its bounty. So it was done of old, as we read in Acts vi. But we never find this kind of selection where the ministry of the word is concerned. . . . The difference between that which the word of God acknowledges, and that which is seen nowadays, lies in this, that according to Scripture the ministry of the word, in its call and in its exercise, is more truly divine than that which is now substituted for it in Christendom. . . . If preachers be sent *by men*, it is an usurpation of the Lord's prerogative, and the gravest detriment to His servants who submit to it. What is the effect of ministry exercised according to Scripture ? The most perfect freedom from all that is given of God for the blessing of souls." (*Lectures, etc.*, pp. 114 sqq.) In practice, Mr. Kelly's school did not follow the Friends in "recording" ministers whose gifts approved themselves, nor was there any system for expressing a meeting's "unity" with travelling ministers ; but the differences lie outside the theological sphere.

As the Church is constituted by the indwelling of the Spirit, and not by any appointment of human channels for the transmission of grace, and as authority in the Church depends on Christ's Presence, and not on any order or prescribed administration, Mr. Kelly becomes a champion of advanced Protestantism in assigning all the prerogatives

of the Church of God to the twos and threes that gather in Christ's Name. To remit and retain sins is not the work of a special priesthood; it is not, as a feeble compromise would make it, a prerogative confided to the apostles, and lapsing at their death. "The spirit, form and substance of [the gospel of John] are devoted to what is intrinsic and essential and what passes not away. . . . The Lord Jesus has 'the disciples' as such before Him, and to them He imparts the Spirit as the power of risen life; them he thereon charges with this spiritual commission." ("*Receive ye the Holy Ghost,*" p. 9.) He seems, however, to limit the prerogative to a power on the part of the Christian society to adjudicate on the claims of candidates for admission to it.

Passing to *eschatology*, Mr. Kelly's views are too well known to require a lengthy description. He was a resolute Futurist, and probably the most important of the exponents of the Apocalypse who have introduced into Futurism the doctrine of the Secret Rapture of the Church. According to this doctrine, which seems to have first come into notice in England amongst the oracles of the inspired Irvingites,¹ the Church is to be secretly caught up "to meet the Lord in the air" at a period considerably anterior to Christ's coming to establish His personal reign on earth. Mr. Kelly, however (*The Rapture of the Saints: who suggested it?* 1903), has recently denied that the Brethren received the doctrine from such a discredited source as Irvingism. The removal of the Church is not perceived by the world except partially, and then only by its results. It closes the probation of Christendom. The doctrine certainly harmonizes with the general type of eschatology represented by Mr. Kelly. The Church is as it were a piece of by-play in the development of the Divine dispensations. When

¹ It had, I believe, been previously taught by the Spanish Roman Catholic priest Lacunza, who wrote under the *nom de plume* of Ben-Ezra.

it has been removed, there is a return to the state of things that existed before it was called into being. A godly Jewish remnant—a hypothetical company that plays a large part in Mr. Kelly's doctrine of last things—comes into being. It is repentant, and has the "testimony of Jesus," but without Christian status, and it constitutes the germ of the converted Jewish nation which is to be the organ of universal blessing. An unprecedented storm of persecution (the Great Tribulation) is the prelude of the appearing of Christ to judge the nations, bind Satan, and reign with His saints a thousand years. It is the peculiar honour of the Christian Church that it escapes the Great Tribulation.

Mr. Kelly agrees with chiliasts in general in affirming the personal character of Christ's reign, the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, the rebuilding of the temple, the resumption of material and even of animal sacrifices, which are to be offered throughout the millennium. But unlike most of his fellows, he feels the difficulty from which he nevertheless sees no escape. "Beyond a doubt," he says in his *Notes on Ezekiel* (p. 217), "the main stumblingblock in this section to most Christians is the plain prediction of sacrifices, feasts, and other ordinances according to the Levitical law. . . . Earthly priests distinct from the people, with a position quite peculiar to the prince [whom Mr. Kelly prudently declines to identify with the Messiah], a material sanctuary with tangible sacrifices and offerings, are distinctly predicted by Ezekiel; but these are evidently wholly foreign to Christianity. One as much as the other would be inconsistent with the doctrine set down in that Epistle [Hebrews] for the 'partakers of the heavenly calling'; but will they therefore be out of place and season for those who have the earthly calling, when Jehovah again makes choice of Jerusalem, and glory shall dwell in the land? . . .

No doubt it is not Christianity ; but who with such an array of inspired witnesses against him will dare to say that such a state of things will not be according to the truth, and for the glory, of God in that day ? ” It is very likely that nothing but the overwhelming weight of the influence of Mr. Darby’s scheme prevented the difficulty from growing to irresistible proportions in a mind so penetrating as Mr. Kelly’s.

Mr. Kelly’s *christology* was of a much more orthodox complexion. His close adherence to the traditional doctrine of the Church in this respect is of great interest. He was certainly not animated by any love of orthodoxy for mere orthodoxy’s sake : indeed, his tendency was rather to exaggerate, perhaps even wantonly at times, his divergence from ordinary views. It was characteristic of his school to feel that they had all Christendom to correct. Yet Mr. Kelly was the staunchest upholder of the entire Nicene and Athanasian doctrine. No divergence whatever from the “ teaching of the Church ” discloses itself until we come to the later refinements of ecumenical doctrine ; and even then the differences are small. We have fortunately a very recent statement of his position (*Life eternal : Christ’s Person*, 1902). A certain tendency—I would not call it more—towards an Apollinarian point of view is discernible among Mr. Darby’s followers as far back as sixty years ago. It long remained comparatively in abeyance, but came at last to a head in the teaching of the late Mr. F. E. Raven, whom Mr. Kelly charged roundly with the heresy of Apollinarius. Mr. Raven seems at some points to have gone the length of monophysitism, for he only allowed the form (i.e. evidently the outward form, *σχῆμα* not *μορφή*) of man to have been taken by Christ from woman. But rather oddly he adopted the church doctrine (or at least the term) of the “ impersonal humanity ” of our Lord. Here Mr. Kelly again joins issue

with him. So at least I am disposed to understand Mr. Kelly's complaint that in Mr. Raven's "theory the soul does not enter Christ's personality, which is exclusively the Logos." But the impersonal humanity, though "church doctrine," is church doctrine at its point of perilous approximation to monotheletism, and I judge that Mr. Kelly meant to deliberately reject it. It is the doctrine of no council (Schaff), and Mr. Kelly with his contempt—it was nothing less—for the Fathers as theologians, and with certainly no servile respect for councils of the Church, would have smiled at the idea of receiving his christology at the hands of John of Damascus.

The christological question is of great importance, for Mr. Kelly's school has by two or three writers been suspected of a Socinian bias. The imputation is simply ridiculous, and it is worth while to point out that its basis is nothing but the fact that Mr. Darby and Mr. Kelly both translated *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου* (Acts xx. 28), 'by the blood of His own (Son).' As a matter of fact they were better exegetes than to accept the rendering of the English versions as satisfactory; and though their translation is probably inadmissible, it is nearly equivalent in sense to Dr. Hort's suggestion: "through the blood that was His own,' i.e. as being His Son's." Dr. Hort, moreover, by an almost convincing conjectural emendation, would bring the Greek text into absolute conformity with Mr. Kelly's English. If Mr. Kelly had any dogmatic bias in this instance, it was assuredly not Socinian, but anti-monophysitic. He defends his rendering at considerable length in his commentary on Acts, discussing Dr. Hort's note, and declining on principle to entertain the conjectural alteration of the text. "Conjectural emendation in N.T. Scripture has never," he says, "approached a proof of its need or value in a solitary example." It may surely be questioned, however, whether

both need and value are not exemplified in the case in point.

It is in the kindred subject of *soteriology* that Mr. Kelly's views have probably their greatest interest. Whether correct or erroneous, they are acute, independent (apart from his relation to Mr. Darby), and at the same time sober.

The *atonement* "lies at the very basis of all God's ways"; it "has incomparably the deepest place of all truths in Scripture, save only Christ's person." (*Pentateuch*, pp. 264-5.) Atonement is effected by Christ enduring Divine wrath as the penalty for sin; but Mr. Kelly avoided the stumblingblock of estimating the atonement by quantitative standards. "What had the work of Christ in view? Not only the entire, present, and everlasting removal before God of all our iniquities, but the glorifying Himself even about sin by virtue of Christ's atoning death." (*The Day of Atonement*, 1902, p. 11.) "Had He not been man, of what avail for us? Had He not been God, all must have failed to give to His suffering for sins *the infinite worth of Himself.*" (*Jesus Forsaken of God*, p. 3. Italics mine.) Mr. Kelly immediately adds: "This is atonement. And atonement has two parts in its character and range. It is expiation before God; it is also substitution for our sins (Lev. xvi. 7-10, Jehovah's lot and the people's lot.)" Mr. Kelly's position, therefore, was not precisely what is meant either by a universal or by a limited atonement, by a general or by a particular redemption. I think his thought would fairly be represented by saying that propitiation is general, substitution particular. The expiation of sin is of infinite value, and therefore essentially unlimited; substitution is restricted to those who, after the analogy to which he appeals in Leviticus xvi. 21 sqq., confess over the head of the sacrificial Victim their iniquities, transgressions and sins. Of course, this view concedes the crucial point claimed by the doctrine of universal atonement.

With regard to *justification*, a brief summary must suffice. Mr. Kelly deals largely with the topic. *The Righteousness of God : What is it ?* and the *Notes on Romans*, which obtained a merited encomium from Messrs. Sanday and Headlam, may be consulted. It is notorious that Mr. Kelly denied that the believer is justified, in whole or in part, by the imputation to him of the righteousness that Christ obtained by keeping the law ; but it is by no means the case that he identified justification with forgiveness. The believer, he taught, is justified by Christ's death. Death is the denounced penalty of sin, and those that have died have paid the penalty and obtained their quittance. Since the believer is reckoned to have died with Christ, he is necessarily reckoned righteous. Over the dead the law has no claim : he is justified.

Closely linked in Mr. Kelly's mind with this doctrine of justification is his explanation of the phrase, the righteousness of God. This is not God's gift of righteousness, nor anything in the same order of ideas. Neither is it God's attribute of righteousness. It is God's personal righteousness in the act of justifying the ungodly. This sense, which seems to be required in Romans iii. 25, 26, Mr. Kelly assigns to the expression throughout St. Paul's argument. God "is just, because sin has been met in the cross ; sin has been judged of God ; it has been suffered and atoned for by Christ. More than that : the Lord Jesus has so magnified God, and so glorified His character, that there is a positive debt now on the other side." (*Righteousness of God*, p. 22.)

Mr. Kelly considered that his view, by making justification depend simply on the efficacy of Christ's atonement, did honour to His death without disparagement of His life. He totally rejected, it is true, the view that any sufferings of Christ, other than those of His death, were in any sense

vicarious or of redeeming efficacy. He equally denied that Christ's obedience, except in death, justifies; but he distinctly disclaims the denial "that the ways, the walk, the life of Jesus, the magnifying of God in all His ways, are anything to our account. God forbid!" he says; "we have Jesus wholly, and not in part. . . . I am not contending now at all against the precious truth that, Christ being our acceptance, we have Christ as a whole." (*Op. cit.* p. 10.) "But then, say they, you need righteousness besides [i.e. in addition to the blood of Christ]; and for this God needs Christ to obey the law for you. And what does Scripture say? It gives me the life of Christ, but life on the other side; not Christ keeping for me the law on the earth, but Christ risen: it is life in resurrection. . . . Union is not with the blessed Lord as under the law, but with Him risen and exalted on high" (p. 31). The thought is that the believer has passed, in Christ, into a sphere where law does not apply. It is not made for the righteous man; and those who stand in Christ on the far side of death (and therefore of judgment) are not amenable to a legal verdict. To base their justification on the imputation that they have kept the law is therefore to deny the essential blessings and glories of Christianity.¹

This view of justification gives the clue to the antinomianism with which Mr. Kelly and his school have been so pertinaciously charged. Dr. William Reid, in his famous polemic, cited the Ten Commandments one by one, and

¹ Mr. Kelly distinctly reckons this status in the risen Christ a part of justification. It corresponds with the "positive" justification of the ordinary evangelical scheme; and so far it is true that he held "justification in a risen Christ." This, according to Mr. Kelly, is the force of *δικαιωσις ζωῆς* in Romans v. 18. But there is no question of basing justification on an "inherent" or "infused" righteousness. It is the Christian's place in Christ, and not the change of heart and purpose that affords a ground of justification.

asked if the duties they enjoin are duties no longer. But this was a notable *ignoratio elenchi*. Mr. Kelly held that the principles of the Decalogue were included (unless it were in respect of the Sabbath) in that righteous requirement of the law which is fulfilled in those who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. But the Spirit and not the law is the guide of life, and the instrument of the discipline and culture of life. The law, not being made for the righteous man, is essentially restrictive, and what Christians require is not restriction, but liberty of expansion for the new life. The allegorizing of St. Paul on Abraham's two sons is, to the school represented by Mr. Kelly, the profoundest word that can ever be spoken on the secret of the victorious life of Christian holiness. "Give liberty to the son of the free-woman" (i.e. to the expansion of the new nature), was one of their watchwords. Mr. Kelly absolutely denied the abrogation of the law. The law is not dead, but the Christian is dead to it. "The grace under which the Christian is widens the sphere and deepens the character of Christian obedience, the directory of which is all the word of God, which the Spirit alone can enable us rightly to divide and really to carry out." (*The Evangelical Organs of 1866*, p. 21.) Many theologians, unfriendly to Mr. Kelly's general standpoint, would not hesitate to reckon such antinomianism strictly Pauline.

The *sacraments* have nothing to do with salvation. *Regeneration* is wholly by the Word and Spirit. "Water" in John iii. 5 is a symbolical designation of the Word of God in its cleansing power, after the analogy of John xv. 3¹ and

¹ On this passage, in his *Exposition of the Gospel of John*, Mr. Kelly observes: "The cleansing efficacy of the word is a cardinal truth of Scripture apt to be forgotten, not merely by the Romanist who trusts in ordinances, but by the Protestant who speaks exclusively of the Saviour's blood 'that cleanseth from all sin.' God forbid that a word should be said to obscure that blood, or to turn a soul from its justifying value. But

1 Peter i. 22, 23. Baptism was the one subject on which Mr. Kelly differed seriously from Mr. Darby, and probably on that account he expressed his views very sparingly. When he wrote expressly on the subject, it was to denounce the "superstition" and "delusion" that baptism saves. Neither was the Lord's Supper a means of grace. It was indeed of immense importance, and the stress laid on its regular weekly observance and on its central position in Christian worship is of course one of the great outstanding features of Mr. Kelly's school of thought. But its character is commemorative and eucharistic, and Mr. Kelly would have thought it degraded by association with the thought of benefit to accrue to the partaker. He also attached great importance to the social aspect of the observance, and to its expression of the unity of the Church. It "is the symbol of unity with Christ, founded on His death Who is now on high. That those who partake of the one loaf are the one body of Christ is the great idea, as well as the announcement of His death. Hence the Apostle Paul, who beyond all made known the mystery of Christ and the Church, has a special revelation concerning this given to him from heaven." (*The Lord's Supper*, p. 8.) "He blessed; but there is no thought of consecration here, still less of consubstantiation or of transubstantiation. He gave thanks; but he did exactly the same when distributing the five barley loaves and two fishes. . . . The disciples ate bread and drank wine; and the whole blessing is the power of faith coming in and investing what was before it, though the simplest materials, with the deepest associations of God's grace in the death of His beloved Son. . . . Every scheme which exalts the elements, or aggrandizes those who 'administer' to the communicants, takes away from Christ." (*Ibid.*)

out of the Lord's side flowed water and blood; and we need both. The blood atones, the water purifies."

Mr. Kelly's system was of course based on the doctrine of plenary verbal inspiration, but he insisted strongly on the human element. God, he tells us, was pleased to work "on man and in man, so that the reproach of 'mechanical' is unfounded, no less than the setting up of 'dynamical' is cold and insufficient. The inspired are through His goodness far beyond being His pen or even His penmen. . . . Their minds and affections He uses as well as their language." In textual matters Mr. Kelly allowed himself a free hand, and his conclusions, though moderate, are not extraordinarily conservative.

Mr. Kelly's writings are injured by prolixity, and too often by the more serious fault of a certain acrimonious tendency in controversy. The fault was that of a less tolerant age than our's, rather than one special to him. Indeed the virulence displayed on the opposite side of many of his controversies was extreme. On the whole, a closer acquaintance with his work, though it would seldom nowadays lead to a general agreement with him, would ensure respect for his earnestness and devotion, his acumen and learning, and the strength of his grasp of all the ramifications of an extensive system. He knew his own mind on every passage of Scripture, and he had studied them all minutely. "A man who, born for the universe, narrowed his mind by Darbyism," was Mr. Spurgeon's verdict, and he did not go too far. The judgment indeed is erroneous if it means that Darbyism might be disentangled from the web of Mr. Kelly's theology and leave something substantial by which to estimate him. But it is perfectly right if understood to mean that, could he only have been freed from the life-long bonds of his youthful enthusiasm for Mr. Darby's system, Mr. Kelly had qualities that would have enabled him to leave a permanent mark on the development of theology.

W. B. NEATBY.

*THE PHILOSOPHICAL METHOD OF THE NEW
THEOLOGY.*

IN venturing upon a discussion of the philosophical basis of the Rev. R. J. Campbell's book called *The New Theology*, I wish at the outset to warn readers against certain misconceptions which readily possess the mind at such a juncture. One misconception, which is perhaps natural enough, is that those who do not agree with the theories put forward by Mr. Campbell are prejudiced against all reform of theology. They are persons quite contented with current orthodoxy, crusted theological Tories fearing lest any change in doctrine should imperil the existence of faith, men so habituated to ancient shibboleths that the sound of any newer phraseology is of necessity blasphemy in their ears. Against this notion a vigorous protest needs to be uttered. There are many men who see quite clearly that a restatement of Christian doctrine is necessary, and who earnestly seek such guidance as shall show how that restatement can be made in an effective and reasonable fashion, so that theology may renew her attraction to enlightened and pious minds and may take her proper place as queen of the sciences. They find it, however, utterly impossible to accept the teaching of *The New Theology* and refuse to follow Mr. Campbell, not because they are obscurantists or because they think that all change is degeneration, but because they have the interests of a real reform of theology at heart. They feel that, at the present moment, there is nothing more favourable to reaction or more inimical to true progress than the theories which are being urged upon them as an acceptable exposition of liberal theology. To them it is therefore clear that the first duty of the reformer is to scrutinize these theories

closely and to criticize them with the utmost candour. They fear Mr. Campbell's teaching, not lest it should accelerate, but lest it should postpone the coming of a true theology.

The second misconception against which a warning should be uttered is that which assumes an antithesis between *The New Theology* and some system called the Old Theology. Mr. Campbell always speaks as though there were some definite theological system accepted by all Christians save a group of daring heretics of whom he is a mouthpiece, and as though this system were in direct opposition to his teaching. The contrary of this is the case. There was not, when Mr. Campbell published his book, and is not now, any generally accepted Old Theology. There were and are the fragments of a number of theologies. The teaching from our pulpits and in our theological books was and is of confusing variety. Calvinism and Arminianism, Determinism and Free Will doctrine, Gnosticism and Agnosticism, Salvation by Faith and Salvation by Works—these and a host of other antithetic principles jostle one another continually, not only within the confines of one denomination, but, often enough, within the limits of one sermon. The theological literature of the past twenty-five years is one continuous denial of the amazing misconception that British theology has been dominated by a definite system of doctrine properly called the Old Theology.

Again, it is well to state clearly that the methods or tendencies which Mr. Campbell cites as supporting his teaching, are in many instances quite irrelevant to it, and none of them lends to his theology any authoritative support. These methods and tendencies are modern, and have great influence with us. They are, among others, the Higher Criticism, social sympathies and natural science. These are names to conjure with, and Mr. Campbell does

conjure with them. But I venture to say that it is mere conjuring, and that none of these things is necessarily involved in the main body of his teaching, and that all are at least compatible with those doctrines he denounces. They are part of the subject matter with which every theologian must deal, either directly or indirectly, and it is mischievous to assert that they sanction speculations with which in reality they have but the vaguest connexion. That is to say, it is possible for a theologian to have the greatest respect for modern biblical research, and the deepest sympathy with the social aspirations of this age, and the humblest regard for what natural science can teach, without being in any degree a supporter of Mr. Campbell's teaching.

Now there is a definite connexion between these three warnings. The peculiarity of Mr. Campbell's New Theology is not its novelty, or its emancipation from older formularies, or its sympathy with modern methods and tendencies. It is something quite distinct from these, namely, a method of theologizing which is involved in a definite *Weltanschauung*. His teaching, where it is logically and successfully combatted, is opposed, not because of its novelty or its antithesis to what is older, or its sympathy with modern aspirations and achievements, but because of its method and its *Weltanschauung*. True, this teaching is seen to result in the rejection of many things of infinite spiritual value, and it is this rejection that stirs the hearts of the bulk of Mr. Campbell's critics. But theologians must not be content to protest against results—indeed, as scientific theologians (making for the moment a distinction which is not really valid, between the theologian or thinker and the religious man or believer) they have in the first place to deal only with methods, not with results. If we get the right method and apply it properly, the results *must* be right. So then we now ask, What is Mr. Campbell's method? What

is his object, and what are the means he adopts to secure that object ?

I.

“The New Theology is an untrammelled return to the Christian sources in the light of modern thought.” When I first read this sentence, which occurs in the first chapter of Mr. Campbell’s book, I am free to admit that my pulse quickened. What a noble prospect it suggested! For a moment I put down the book and enjoyed the fair vision as of a promised land. If only we could enter that Canaan, leaving the desert of metaphysical abstractions and the cramping camps of our conventional creeds for the rich pasturage of that land flowing with milk and honey! I took the book again and harked back to the previous sentence: “And, creed or no creeds, we hold that the religious experience which came to mankind in Jesus of Nazareth is enough for all our needs, and only requires to be freed from limiting statements in order to lay firm hold once more upon the civilized world.” Yes, I thought, that is the right line of advance. We must approach the consciousness of Jesus Himself as the real source of Christian revelation and the maker of Christian experience, and from this work out our new theology. So I started with a fresh zest to see whither this principle, rigidly applied, would lead the daring thinker. But alas! the very next sentence drove black clouds before my Pisgah prospect. I had thought in Mr. Campbell’s company to take part in “an untrammelled return to the Christian sources,” but no sooner were my hopes raised than our author went on to say that the starting point of the New Theology was “a re-emphasis of the Christian belief in the Divine immanence in the universe and in mankind.” Sunshine was swiftly blotted out by fog. For here Mr. Campbell was in utmost lightness

of heart taking up one favoured doctrine and making this the condition and limit of his "return to the Christian sources." There is no pretence that the doctrine of "Divine immanence in the universe and in mankind" is obtained by an unprejudiced examination of the primitive Christian records. It is favoured rather because of its supposed harmony with modern philosophic thought. That is, it is at once a trammel upon the theologian in his research. And yet Mr. Campbell does not seem to be aware for a moment that in going from one to the other of the two sentences quoted he is completely changing his point of view. He does not realize that he is guilty of any inconsistency. He fancies that in the assertion of the views which make up the bulk of his volume (views which we shall soon have to look at more closely) he is actually engaged in this "untrammelled return." He believes himself to be altogether freed from the dead hand of traditionalism and from the repetition of formulae which make us deaf to the voice of the actual. So convinced is he that he is emancipated from dogmatism that, in a recent article in the *Hibbert Journal*, he has made this statement as to his teaching: "Its emphasis is positive, not negative; it is a return to simplicity of statement and to the preaching of an ethical gospel. Like Humanism, it discards every *theologoumenon* which has not a practical ethical value."

Scattered throughout *The New Theology* are indications that there lingers in Mr. Campbell's mind a reminiscence of the Pisgah prospect to which for a moment he turned his gaze in the first chapter. In discussing the doctrine of the Fall he says: "It is not integral to Christianity, for Jesus never said a word about it." Here is an attempt, clumsy it is true and unsuccessful, but nevertheless real, to apply the authority of Jesus as the source of our faith

to a definite doctrine. But it is only in rare instances that this test is applied, and no position is really based upon it. The doctrine of idealistic Monism, for example, is never judged by this standard.

Once or twice, indeed, Mr. Campbell utters in a pregnant sentence some truth gained by first-hand "untrammelled return to Christian sources." For instance, "It is no use trying to place Jesus in a row along with other religious masters. He is first and the rest nowhere; *we have no category for Him.*"¹ And again, "The life of Jesus was the undimmed revelation of the highest," and "how He managed to deliver His peerless teaching while making so little allusion to current Jewish modes of thought and worship is a mystery." Yet in every case he hastens to bury such words out of sight. He finds plenty of categories for Jesus: "Jesus was God, but so are we"; and, having made certain statements about the consciousness of Jesus, he asks: "Why should we not speak in a similar way about any other human consciousness?" And as for mystery, in other passages Mr. Campbell scouts the very idea, as when he says, "I do not think the Atonement is such a very great mystery after all, and it ought to be possible to get at the heart of it without stultifying the intellect. Anyhow, let us try."

At certain intervals then we see that Mr. Campbell has some notion as to the proper method of elaborating a new theology. But he does not apply his notion. It merely flits once in a while across his thought. He has another method in practice, and we shall now look at that method in some detail.

II.

Mr. Campbell has nothing to say in his book about faith.

¹ The italics are mine.

The reason is obvious. To him the intellect is everything. It is decisive in morals as well as in philosophy. "There is not," he says, "and never has been, an act of the will in which a man, without bias in either direction, has deliberately chosen evil in the presence of good." The phrase "without bias in either direction" almost robs the sentence of significance, but obviously Mr. Campbell means that an apprehension of the wickedness of a thing must be followed by the repudiation of that thing. It is the Socratic position that sin is due to ignorance. Selfishness, which is sin, is a quest of life and of God, but it is a blundering, unreasoned or unenlightened quest. The difference between selfishness and love is at bottom intellectual—due to the presence or absence of rational illumination. The crucial things are logically concatenated ideas. Of this Mr. Campbell has no doubt. "I dare say even the man in the street knows, quite as certainly as the man in the schools, that a metaphysical proposition underlies the doing of every moral act, even though it may never be expressed." If this be so, ultimate reality can be got at by the intellect, and by hard thinking eternal truths can be gripped. So the intellect is the final authority as to truth. In the statement, "The true seat of authority is within, not without, the human soul," the word "intellect" should be substituted for "soul." Now this intellectualism may be taken as an element in Mr. Campbell's method which is incompatible with his avowed principle of "untrammelled return to the Christian sources." It makes him quite ready to come to decisions independently of Jesus. His doctrine of the Trinity, from this intellectualist point of view, is not the outcome of revelation, nor is it necessarily derived from "the Christian sources." "I contend," he says, "that if we had never heard of the doctrine in connexion with Jesus, we should have to invent it now in order to account for ourselves and the

wondrous universe in which we live." And so too with other fundamental truths. They are not founded on faith, or on the revelation that is in Jesus. "Why is there a universe at all?" asks Mr. Campbell, and then answers, "What I have to say leads back through Hegelianism to the old Greek thinkers, and beyond them again to the wise men who lived and taught in the East ages before Jesus was born. It is that this finite universe of ours is one means to the self-realization of the infinite."

So then we see that the actual method of Mr. Campbell, instead of being "an untrammelled return to the Christian sources," is an untrammelled reliance upon the intellect—an untrammelled speculation. We now have to see in what direction this leads him.

III.

Before following Mr. Campbell's course thus, one remark must be made. Our author professes great respect for science—indeed, he claims to be her champion, and says, "The New Theology is the religion of science. . . . Science is supplying the facts which the New Theology is weaving into the texture of religious experience." Of beliefs which he criticizes he says, "they go straight in the teeth of the scientific method, which, even where the Christian facts are concerned, is the only method which carries weight with the modern mind." But these are only phrases, and by their use Mr. Campbell forces us to examine his references to science and to ask what sign he gives of an understanding of scientific method. We conclude that he has no remotest notion of what modern science means. I say this without any reservation. If there is one thing which the author of *The New Theology* has quite neglected to master, it is that "scientific method" which he asserts to be alone convincing to-day. For, in point of fact, the

project which he briefly stated and then gave up—that of the “untrammelled return to the Christian sources”—implied the scientific method. But Mr. Campbell’s adoption of intellectualism killed any chance he had of using the scientific method, which is based on observation and experiment and not upon speculation.

Since he has turned aside from scientific method and adopted intellectualism, we find at once that Mr. Campbell is hampered by certain assumptions. They are part and parcel of his intellectual equipment, and their effect is to bring him constantly face to face with pompous metaphysical riddles. For instance, he says, “There cannot be two infinities, nor can there be an infinite and also a finite beyond it.” These propositions would not bother a scientist for a moment. For, in the first place, if you use the word “infinite” in such a way as to give it any practical value at all, the whole statement is false. There is an indefinite series of infinities. You can have infinite extension in an infinite series of directions; you can have infinite duration in an infinite series of positions; and the two infinities of time and space may exist together and may be conceived without difficulty. But Mr. Campbell is not thinking of these infinities. He is thinking of an infinite which includes all special infinities—all infinities with which a mathematician, for instance, might deal. And so, in the second place, his statement, instead of being the profound announcement some might think it, is a mere tautology, and meaningless at that. When we speak of an infinite in the sense of Mr. Campbell’s sentence—“Whatever distinctions of being there may be within the universe, it is surely clear that they must all be transcended and comprehended within infinity”—we mean no more than that we can apply the word infinite to the unthinkable congeries of finites, by abstracting from their differences

and calling them *one*. We shut our minds to their variety and their numberlessness—to the fact that they are *not* one, but an indefinite host—and say, “We will think of them under the one symbol—infinite.” I cannot pause to elaborate this further, but will put it thus: we speak of the infinite thus simply in our effort to apply the category of number (and reduce to unity) what is in fact *numberless*.

The distinction between the infinite and the finite which Mr. Campbell (having neglected scientific method) thinks so important, occurs in many guises. For instance, it makes him ask the question, “Why has the unlimited become limited?” which is a question like that of the Red Queen in *Through the Looking-Glass*, “What’s the French for Fiddle-de-dee?” It has no facts behind it, and is in its implications as wild a bit of speculation as the statement, “I start, then, with the assumption that the universe is God’s thought about Himself.”

Obviously this intellectualism of Mr. Campbell’s leads to a method which is the direct antithesis of the scientific method, namely, that of defining first and looking at the facts afterwards with a view to forcing the definition upon them. The assumption is made that the universe (whatever that may be) is “God’s thought about Himself,” and of course the facts of experience (sin for instance) must be made to fit in. This method is stated clearly enough when Mr. Campbell comes to deal with Jesus in Chapter V. In the first part of his chapter he manufactures definitions of deity, divinity and humanity, and then (although he had said “we have no category” for Jesus) he says, “Now let us apply these definitions to the personality of Jesus.”

These effects of Mr. Campbell’s intellectualism have their chief outcome in his doctrine of idealistic Monism, and to this we will now turn.

NEWTON H. MARSHALL.

(To be continued.)

THE DIVINE CHILD IN VIRGIL.

II.

IN the former part of this study ¹ it was pointed out that the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil, with its hope and confident prophecy of a better age which had already surely begun, was only one indication, though the most striking one, of a dawning hope, which was spreading in the Roman Empire. This poem was also the first clear and articulate expression of that hope; and indubitably exercised considerable influence in giving form and definition to the vague emotion which was stirring in the popular mind, felt by many, and expressed by one great writer.

The Fourth Eclogue had its origin in an interesting episode of literary history; and, if it were regarded solely from the literary point of view, it might almost be called an occasional poem. But what might have been a mere occasional poem in the hands of a lesser poet, became in passing through the mind of Virgil a work of far wider and higher character. It is, however, essential to a right comprehension of this Eclogue that it should be studied in its origin. Only in this way can its relation to the popular conceptions of the time be understood.

It was through the relations between Virgil and Horace, so friendly and for the latter so important, that this poem

¹ EXPOSITOR, June, 1907. On p. 555 l. 11 "unsuitable" should be corrected to "suitable." I made a change in the form of the sentence at the last moment, and failed to carry out the change consistently through the whole sentence, thus reducing it to nonsense; but probably readers would make the correction for themselves.

of Virgil's took its actual form.¹ Horace was an officer, who served in the army of Brutus and Cassius, and took part in the disastrous battle of Philippi, which wrecked the aristocratic and republican party, late in the year 42 B.C. He fled from the rout of Philippi and returned to Italy, where he found that the estate at Venusia which he had inherited from his father had been confiscated and assigned (like many other Italian estates) to the soldiers of the victorious armies. He came to Rome, where, as he says,

Bereft of property, impaired in purse,
Sheer penury drove me into scribbling verse.

The metropolis was the only place which offered at that time a career to a young man conscious of literary power, and compelled to seek a living thereby. Horace had now neither property nor patron nor influential friend. As an adherent of the defeated and unpopular party, the young poet's career was doubly difficult; and we could not suppose that his republican and aristocratic sentiments were blazoned by him in Rome when he settled there. That these sentiments were now concealed by him is proved by the fact that he found employment as a clerk in one of the government offices: a pronounced aristocrat would not have received, and would hardly have asked, such a position.

Horace's mind was not that of a zealot or an extremist. He had fought for the side which he believed in, and he accepted the result of the fight. The question for him was settled, and he now accommodated himself unreservedly to the new situation. Moreover, he had unquestionably lost his faith in his former party, from causes at which the historian can guess without any difficulty. He recog-

¹ The thought must have been simmering in the mind of Virgil, but the form was suggested as a reply to a poem of Horace. My own personal view is that the two poems inaugurated the personal relations and intimate friendship of the two poets.

nized that it was incapable and dead, and that Rome had nothing to hope from it, even if it had been successful in the fight. Every reader of his works knows that such was his feeling, and such was the widespread feeling of the Roman world. Men recognized that the degeneration of the Mediterranean world had proceeded one stage further, and that the republican party had failed decisively to govern the Empire which it had conquered. Horace represents the general opinion of the pagan world. He stands in the world of men, not above it (as Virgil did); he expresses the sentiments of the world from a sane, common-sense point of view; and, as he emerged from penury, he attained a high level of wisdom, propriety and self-respect in his outlook on the world and a singularly lofty level of easy and graceful yet dignified expression of popular philosophy and worldly experience. From him we gather the best side of popular sentiment and popular philosophy, as they were trained in the stern school of life.

In one of Horace's poems the popular estimate of the situation in which the Roman world was placed found full expression. This poem is the Sixteenth Epode, which stands at the end of the first period of his literary activity and prepares the entrance on his second period. In the first period he was the hungry wolf, the impoverished and disappointed writer, who had felt the injustice of the world and was embittered by his experience. In the Sixteenth Epode he pours forth unreservedly the disappointment, which he and the people generally felt about the existing situation of the Roman world. The long civil wars had sickened and disgusted the popular mind, except in so far as they had brutalized it into positive enjoyment of the apparently endless series of intestine wars and massacres, each more bloody than its predecessor. The Roman Empire and Roman Society were drifting steadily towards ruin,

and their motion onwards towards the abyss was becoming ever more rapid.

This consciousness of degeneration and approaching ruin generally turned to utter despair. No hope was apparent. The Roman people had outgrown its old religion, and had found no new religion to take its place. Hence there was no religious consolation for it, no God to whom it could look for help and salvation. To which of the deities should the Roman people turn : what prayer would avail to importune Vesta and the old Divine patrons of the State and compel them to help the city and the Empire in their need ? So asks Horace in the second Ode of the first book, a poem written at a considerably later date, when he thought he had found a new god and a present help. But in the first period of his literary work he had no hope. He had not even a political party to which he could join himself and for which he could fight. He had lost his old faith in the Republican party, and found nothing to replace it ; the mind of man craved for the help of God, and there was no God known to it. So Horace consoled himself by an excursion into the land of fancy and of dreams. The Romans, as he says, had now only one chance left, They could abandon their country, and go far away from Italy into the Western Ocean, to find that happy land of which legend tells and poets sing, where the Golden Age of quiet and peace and plenty is always present, because here the degeneration which had affected the whole Mediterranean world had never begun. And so the poet calls upon all true men and good patriots to abandon their country, to desert Rome, and sail far away into the Atlantic Ocean, seeking a "new world to redress the balance of the old world," to dwell in

The rich and happy isles

Where Ceres year by year crowns all the untill'd land with sheaves,

And the vine with purple clusters droops, unpruned of all her leaves ;
Where the olive buds and burgeons, to its promise ne'er untrue,
And the russet fig adorns the tree, that graffshoot never knew ;
Where honey from the hollow oak doth ooze, and crystal rills
Come dancing down with tinkling feet from the sky-dividing hills ;
There to the pails the she-goats come, without a master's word,
And home with udders brimming broad returns the friendly herd.

For Jupiter, when he with brass the Golden Age alloy'd,
That blissful region set apart by the good to be enjoy'd ;
With brass and then with iron he the ages sear'd, but ye,
Good men and true, to that bright home arise and follow me !¹

Evidently, this fanciful description of the Golden Age in the Western Isles, with the advice of the Romans to take refuge there, does not express any serious belief. Horace and the popular mind generally had no cure to suggest for the malady of the State. To them the world of reality had sunk beyond salvation, and human life had degenerated into a riot of bloodshed and strife. Only in dreamland was there any refuge from the evils of actual life. Horace is here only "the idle singer of an empty day," singing in the brief interval between the last massacre and the next one. There is no faith, no belief, no reality, in the poem, because the poet had no religion, while the popular mind knew in a vague fashion that God alone could help now. Despair was seeking a moment's oblivion, and cheating itself with the false words of hope in this poem.

But, while there is no reality in the proposed remedy, no one can doubt or has ever doubted that the poem is political, and touches on the real facts of the Roman situation. This was what the people thought and felt and vaguely said. The old Rome could not stand : the Republican and aristocratic party, which had fought to maintain the old Rome, was mistaken and practically dead, and its policy had

¹ From the translation of Sir Theodore Martin.

utterly failed. The poem is really the expression of a despairing acquiescence in the tyranny of the Triumvirate and the autocracy of the coming Empire. This was the reluctant and despairing view with which Tacitus a century later (and many for whom Tacitus speaks) regarded the government of the Flavian Emperors : a Republican constitution, though the best, was too good for the Roman people, and the autocracy was the only government that was practically possible. And, after a similar fashion, in the Sixteenth Epode Horace abandoned definitely his Republican views, to dream about freedom and to acquiesce in the slavery of Imperialism.

For our purpose the most important feature of the Epode is its expression of the general opinion that no salvation could be hoped for except through some superhuman aid. Man, left to himself, had degenerated and must degenerate. The almost universal pagan view was to that effect ; and history confirms it. St. Paul makes this view the starting point for his philosophy of history : God alone can give help and preserve true civilization. In this the Apostle of the Gentiles agrees with the almost universal Gentile thought. What he adds to it is the evangel of the way, revealed first to the Hebrews imperfectly, now perfectly to all men.

We see, then, that the opinion of Virgil stands by itself, practically solitary in pagan literature. How did this idea of hope of an immediate and present salvation through a new-born child take form in his mind ?

It may be assumed, for the moment, that chronology and general conditions permit the supposition that Virgil's poem started from and gave the answer to Horace's.¹ The late

¹ The Book of Epodes was not published collectively till 30 B.C. ; but it is a well-established fact that important single poems like this were known earlier.

Professor Kiessling, of Berlin, pointed out that Virgil in this poem caught up and echoed two of Horace's phrases. It seems beyond doubt that

nec magnos metuent armenta leones

is not independent of Horace's

nec rivos timeant armenta leones;

and similarly that Virgil's

ipsae lacte domum referent distenta capellae ubera

has some connexion with Horace's

illie iniussae venient ad muletra capellae
refertque tenta grex amicus ubera.

Two contemporary poets, known to one another, each (as we may be certain) familiar with the other's work, do not write in this way by accident. The resemblance is intentional, and was regarded, both by themselves and by the world, as a compliment paid by the imitator to the imitated. The question might be raised, however, which was the imitator; and there is a certain probability, *a priori*, that Horace, as the younger and less distinguished, was the imitator; for we know of other places, in which beyond doubt that was the case. But in this instance Kiessling concludes that Virgil was the one who echoed Horace; and his reasoning from internal evidence seems conclusive.¹ Moreover Virgil's poem was written in the year 40 B.C., and (as is universally accepted) in the latter part of the year whereas Horace's poem, which arose through the horrors and suffering of the bloody Perusian war and expresses the feeling of repulsion excited thereby in the poet's mind, can hardly be placed later than the early months of 40 or the end of 41 B.C. The imitation is a graceful compliment paid by the older and more famous poet to his young and as yet little

¹ I write far from books; and it is many years since I read Kiessling but I think the above statement is correct.

known contemporary. We can appreciate how much the compliment meant to Horace ; and we can understand how the language of his Ode addressed to Virgil is not hyperbolic, but perfectly sincere and well-deserved. It was the kindness and courtesy which Virgil showed to Horace when he was still struggling with poverty that endeared him to the latter ; and this spirit of kindness and courtesy prompted Virgil to pay this graceful compliment, which may be regarded as the beginning of the friendship between the two poets. That friendship opened the door of society to Horace. After a time Virgil introduced him to Maecenas, who became his patron and intimate friend. In the sunshine of moderate prosperity his character expanded and blossomed into the genial temper of his maturer work. A deep gulf caused by a profound difference of tone and spirit, separates that maturer work from his earliest work. While he was struggling amid hard fortune, he was bitter and narrow. What he quickly became after he met Virgil, the world knows and appreciates.

Now, looking at the Fourth Eclogue from this point of view, let us place it beside the Sixteenth Epode, and see what meaning it gathers from the collocation. Horace had said that no hope for the Romans existed, except that they should abandon Italy and Rome, to seek a happy life in the islands of the Western Ocean. Virgil replies that the better age of which Horace dreams is here in Italy present with them, now just beginning. The very words in which Horace had described a fabulous island and a legendary Golden Age are applied by Virgil to describe Italy as it will soon be, as the child already born in Italy will see it. What are mere fanciful marvels when told about an unknown isle of the Ocean become real in the imaginative vision of Virgil, for they are being now realized in Italy under the new order, through the power of the peace and good order and wise

administration, settled government and security of property, which have been established in the country.

Reading the two poems together, and remembering that they were written within a year of one another by two friends, one cannot doubt that they were companion and contrasted pieces, responding one to the other. They say to Rome respectively : " Seek your happiness by fleeing far into the Western Ocean " ; and " Your happiness is now being wrought out before your eyes in Italy." A glance suffices to show the intention to any one who has eyes to see. But in literary criticism inability to see more than one has been taught and habituated to see is the most striking feature of the most learned scholars.

Virgil is the prophet of the new age of Italy. He was always thinking about Italy and imagining what it might be made by the application of prudence, forethought, and true knowledge. The subject of the Georgics is to describe what Italy might become, if agriculture were wisely and thoroughly carried out. " You have all you need in Italy, the most beautiful and the best country of the whole world, if you will only use it right." The intention of the poem is to force this lesson home to the Roman mind.

The practical and skilful administration of Augustus appealed to Virgil. He saw that Augustus had wise plans, and skill to carry them into effect. He was a convinced adherent and apostle of the Emperor. The union of science and government had made the Mediterranean world fertile. The science had originally been supplied by the theocratic order, when the accumulated experience and growing wisdom of a people was concentrated at the hieron of each district, where the Goddess educated and guided, nourished and tended her people. The union of science and government was now beginning to make Italy perfect under the new Empire ; that union would soon destroy every noxious

plant and animal, produce all useful things in abundance from the soil, tame all that was wild, improve nature to an infinite degree, make the thorn tree laugh and bloom with flowers : it would naturalize in Italy all that was best in foreign lands, and thus render Italy independent of imports and so perfectly self-sufficient that navigation would be unnecessary.

In this last detail we have one of those startlingly modern touches, which so often surprise us in Roman literature. Virgil would have no free trade. The ideal he aimed at was that Italy should depend on itself alone, and not on sea-borne products. His ideal is here different from and narrower than the Imperial. He does not think of binding the lands of the whole Empire into a unity, as the Emperors desired ; he wishes only that Italy should learn to produce everything for itself and that thereafter the "estranging sea" should separate once more the lands, and navigation should cease. He probably had not thought of all that was implied in this ideal.

That the Fourth Eclogue stands in close relation with the new Empire is obvious. It is the wise new system of rule that is to produce these blessed results for Italy. But there is as yet no trace of the autocratic idea in the poem. Augustus is neither named nor directly alluded to.

Virgil thinks of the continuance, in an improved form, of the old Roman system of constitutional government by magistrates (*honores*), of the political career open to all Romans in the old way, and of the military training which was the foundation and an essential part of the Roman education. War must continue for a time, in order that the young Roman may be educated in the true Roman fashion. But it will be foreign war, carried on in the East ; new Argonauts must explore and conquer and bring under the Roman peace the distant Orient ; a new Achilles was sailing

for another Troy in the person of Antony, who was charged with the government of the whole East and the conduct of the Parthian war. The triumvirate, Antony, Augustus¹ and Lepidus, was not in appearance an autocracy; it was, in name at least, a board of three commissioners for establishing the Republic, professedly a temporary expedient to cure the troubles of the state. To speak or think of a single Emperor, or to connect the salvation of Rome with any single human being, was treason to the triumvirate, and was specially out of place at the moment when Virgil was writing, shortly after the peace of Brundisium had established concord and equality between Antony and Augustus. In the Eclogue a more obvious allusion is, in fact, made to Antony than to Augustus, for every one at the time recognized Antony in the new Achilles who was starting for an eastern war: the Provinces east of the Adriatic Sea were under Antony's charge, and a Parthian war was in progress.

But, while Antony is more directly alluded to, the thought that incites the poem and warms the poet's enthusiasm is the wise and prudent administration of Italy by Augustus. That is the real subject. The enlightened forethought of Augustus and Agrippa made their rule the beginning of a new era in Italy; and Virgil looked forward to a continuous growth in the country.

Still less is there any dynastic thought in the Fourth Eclogue. The idea that an expected son of Augustus, or the son of any other distinguished Roman, is alluded to, is anachronistic and simply ridiculous. Every attempt to identify the young child mentioned in the poem with any

¹ For convenient reference we may use by anticipation this title; which was not bestowed till January 27 B.C.; it marked a great step forward in the personal and autocratic rule of Augustus, and a noteworthy step in the way towards his deification.

actual child born or to be born has been an utter failure, and takes this Eclogue from a false point of view.

Least of all is there any idea in the Fourth Eclogue of deifying either Augustus personally or a son of his who might hereafter be born.¹ That view is not merely untrue to the existing facts of the conjoint government and the union of Augustus and Antony. It misunderstands and misrepresents the development of the Imperial idea and the growth (or growing perversion) of thought in Rome; it places Virgil on a plane of feeling far too low; it is a hopeless anachronism in every point of view. Schaper, in a very interesting paper, pointed out many years ago that the deification of Augustus and his son and his dynasty was wholly inconsistent with the composition of the Eclogue so early as B.C. 40. The paper was convincing and, in a certain way, conclusive. But instead of drawing the inference that the deification of the dynasty is a false idea, read into the poem under the prejudice caused by the development of history in the years following after A.D. 40, he propounded the impossible theory that the poem was composed at a later time, i.e., in the period ending June B.C. 23, when Augustus was governing no longer as triumvir, but as consul, and was practically sole master of the Empire, though maintaining the Republican forms and the nominal election of another consul along with himself. To support this theory, Schaper eliminated the allusion to Polio's consulship, which fixes the composition to the year 40 B.C., reading *Solis* instead of *Polio*.² To make this theory possible chronologically, and reconcile it with the date of

¹ The idea of some literary critics is that the poem celebrates the birth of an expected son, who unfortunately for the poet turned out to be a daughter. This idea is really too ludicrous for anyone but a confirmed literary and "Higher" Critic. A poet does not work so; even a "poet laureate" could not work under such conditions.

² As he pointed out, the correct spelling of the name was Polio, and not Pollio.

publication of the Eclogues not very long after 40 B.C., Schaper supposed that the Fourth Eclogue was composed at a later date and inserted in a revised second edition of the Eclogues.¹

These impossible buttresses of Schaper's theory were universally rejected; the faults of his paper distracted attention from its real merits; and the perfectly unanswerable argument from which he started was tacitly set aside, as if it shared in the error of the theory which he had deduced from it.

The truth is that the poem belongs to an earlier stage of thought than the worship of Augustus; and the Divine idea in it was still so vague that it was readily capable of being developed in accordance with subsequent history. But it was equally capable of being developed in a different direction and in a nobler and truer style. Had the Pauline idea of Christianity as the religion of the Empire been successfully wrought out during the first century, the Fourth Eclogue would have seemed equally suitable to that line of development. The later popular instinct, which regarded the poem as a prophecy of the birth of Christ, was not wholly incorrect. The poem contained an inchoate idea, unformed and vague, enshrining and embodying that universal need which indicated "the fulness of time" and the world's craving for a Saviour. The Roman world needed a Saviour; it was conscious of its need; it was convinced that only Divine intervention could furnish a Saviour for it. Paul was fully aware that this universal craving and unrest and pain existed in the Roman world; and he saw therein the presage of the birth of Divine truth. "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain until now."

The political side of the Fourth Eclogue is emphatically

¹ Two others, the Sixth and the Tenth, were also supposed by Schaper to have been composed for the enlarged second edition:

marked, and was indubitably recognized universally at the time. It suited the situation, and it glorified the wise policy of Augustus. We are not blind to it. But the significance of this aspect should not blind us to the fact that this alone is quite insufficient to explain the genesis and the full meaning of the poem. Professor Mayor here seems to us to be in the right, as has been argued from additional reasons in the first part of this paper. Virgil had learned something from Hebrew poetry and specially from Isaiah—indirectly, as Professor Mayor thinks, through the rather low-class medium of the Sibylline verses—more directly, as we think, through the medium of a Greek translation of Isaiah.

The Hebrew idea of a growth towards a happier future through the birth of a Divine child was simmering in his mind, when Horace's despairing poem declaring that no happiness for Rome could be found except in voluntary exile to the Islands of the West caught his attention, and drew from him a reply. As a convinced and enthusiastic supporter of Augustus, he declared that peace and happiness was being realized in Italy by the wise rule of the Triumvir. With this he interwove the almost universal thought of his contemporaries that Divine aid alone could afford real and permanent improvement in the condition of the state; and this Divine aid expressed itself to him in the form that he had caught from the Hebrew poetry.

Whom then did he think of as the child? He must have had some idea in his mind. There can be no doubt as to this, if we simply look at the genesis of the Imperial cult. The power of that cult lay in a certain real fact, the majesty and dignity and character of the Roman people, which was assumed to be represented by the Emperor as the head of the state. Augustus permitted worship of himself only in the form of a cult of "Rome and Augustus." To a Roman

like Virgil in B.C. 40, the Divine child, who embodies the future of Rome, who has to go through the education of war and magistracies (as the poem declares), could only be "Rome," i.e., the Roman people collectively, the new generation of Rome, born under happier auspices and destined to glory and advancement in power and in happiness. As Virgil elsewhere apostrophizes the one Roman as typical of the race and its destiny,¹ and as Macaulay imitating him uses the same figurative speech, "Thine, Roman, is the pilum," to paint the Roman racial character, so here the Latin poet, with the Hebrew thought of a child in his mind, can describe the birth and infancy of the child as really taking place with the usual concomitants.

There was more than this in Virgil's poem, more than he was fully conscious of; but this he had in his mind. He did not see, what we can now see, that there was placed before the Empire a dilemma and a necessity. It was a necessity that a new religion should arise for the consolidation of the Empire. There was proposed for the Empire by Paul the new religion of Christ. The Emperors, in refusing the proposal, were inevitably driven to lay stress more and more upon the Imperial religion and the Imperial God. It is not always fully realized that this cult was not very much insisted on until the reign of Domitian, under whom the opposition to Christianity was first developed fully to its logical consequences. Augustus, who instituted the Imperial cult as a support of the state, was always a little ashamed of it; and his successors had something of the same feeling, until Domitian began to take a real pleasure and pride in it.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ In the famous line, often quoted, *tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento.*

*THE APOLOGETIC VALUE OF CRITICISM.*¹

NEW TESTAMENT.

A FEW years ago attention, in this country, was mainly occupied with the attacks of criticism upon the authenticity and historical worth of the Old Testament. Except to those who were acquainted with Continental thought, the New Testament appeared to be almost outside the area of conflict. This is now completely changed. The centre has shifted,—and so keen, so determined is the attack upon the New Testament, that Old Testament criticism, although no less destructive than heretofore, has hardly the same significance that it had. The object of this attack is no secret : it is so to discredit the authenticity of the Gospels as to undermine the Church's belief in the Godhead of Christ. Nothing less, therefore, than the truth of the Incarnation is at stake ; and to say this is to say that the Church is fighting for her very life. Every other theological question has, for the moment, probably much more than the moment, fallen into the background.

Nor can it be denied that negative criticism, brought to bear upon the New Testament, has done much to produce unsettlement of faith in the educated world. Indeed, we may safely say that the disintegrating influence of Pfeiderer, Harnack, Schmiedel, Holtzman, Gardner, Martineau (to name a few representative writers of this class) has gone far deeper and spread far more widely than that of Strauss or Baur more than half a century ago. Beneath the spell of rationalism sincere Christians are in imminent danger of losing their hold upon the living Christ, the Christ of St. Paul and St. John, the Christ of the Church's creeds.

¹ A paper read before the Leamington and Warwick Clerical Society, December 19, 1906.

The humanitarian standpoint of the writers we have named is undisguised. Professor Harnack may open his discussion upon dogma by saying that "Christianity is that religion in which the impulse and power to a blessed and holy life is bound up with faith in God as the Father of Jesus Christ";¹ but when we come to inquire into the sense in which he speaks of God as the Father of Jesus Christ, and of the relation in which Jesus Christ stood to God, we find that there is nothing transcendental in it,—that Jesus Christ is only the wisest and holiest of many teachers, who, from time to time, have appeared upon the stage of history. The Incarnation, in the Catholic sense of the term, is, on *a priori* grounds, set aside as being out of the question.

The object of the present paper is to urge what is apt, in some quarters, to be forgotten, namely, that the weapons with which the conflict on behalf of fundamental truth is maintained have themselves been forged in the workshop of the higher critic,²—that, but for the principles and methods of criticism, the Church would be wholly unprepared to meet the revolutionary and destructive process which has now been in active operation for three quarters of a century. It is not that the thoughtful Christian is afraid of extremists who deny that such a person as Jesus Christ ever existed. To the devout reader of the New Testament, to say nothing of Church history, such a contention is self-refuting. Nor

¹ *History of Dogma*, p. 1. It was of this book that the eminent German theologian, von Frank (by no means an ultra-conservative), said that it "amounts to the annihilation not only of dogma, but of the specifically Christian faith."

² If the expression "higher criticism" is used by the writer in a wider sense than is justified by strict and technical accuracy, it is in deference to the popular use of it in the present day, the term being indiscriminately applied to the whole range of modern criticism, whether textual, literary or historical. For the distinction between the various branches of criticism, see *The Higher Criticism*, Driver & Kirkpatrick, p. vi. ff.

do the more extravagant theories of those who do not go to this length carry much weight, or meet with much support. We did not, for example, wait for Mr. Andrew Lang's crushing reply before rejecting Mr. Frazer's explanation of the story of the Cross and the origin of the belief in the Godhead of Christ.¹ Common sense had already dismissed it as incredible. It is very different, however, when we are dealing with a criticism of which Pfleiderer, Harnack and Gardner may be regarded as exponents. In their writings, faith, instead of finding any solution for its difficulties, may only too easily meet with its own solvent ; and much of the more or less formulated scepticism now prevalent is to be traced to the circulation of the views they represent in the popular literature of the day.

One would not, for a moment, deny that it is possible, at least for the present, for faith—intelligent faith—unaided by the learning of the critic, to face the rationalist without loss. Faith may be strong enough to say, "I know Whom I have believed,—let God be true and every man a liar." Whilst, however, there are some whose intuitive perceptions may place them above the reach of rationalistic criticism, there are many others far less impervious to assault,—many whose temperament and training make intellectual satisfaction a primary need—many who, before everything else, must have a reason for the hope that is in them. Speaking generally, the Christian religion, at any rate on its credal side, is doomed, unless it can claim reason as its handmaid. The negations of the sceptic are not to be met by bare denial, but by solid argument ; and, unless Christianity can make its appeal to the rational faculty, it must slowly, but surely, cease to be the religion of the educated world.

To say this is to bid the higher critic welcome. This has

¹ Mr. Lang's criticism of Mr. Frazer's hypothesis occupies the chief place in his *Magic and Religion*, pp. 76-204.

long been felt and acknowledged in regard to the Old Testament.¹ No thoughtful and believing student of the Old Testament denies his indebtedness to the scholars who have enabled him to encounter, as he deems, on more than equal terms, a criticism which would upheave the very foundations of faith, and reduce the Old Testament to a compilation of purely human origin. No less indispensable to the support and safeguarding of the Faith is New Testament criticism; and no greater mistake could be made than to suppose that, on the one side in this controversy, is arrayed the whole mass of traditional and conservative opinion,—on the other side the whole body of higher critics. The question is not one between conservatism and criticism, but between critic and critic. The real battle of the New Testament is being fought between a destructive criticism on the one hand and a constructive criticism on the other: a criticism which rejects the Incarnation and Resurrection, which denies all historical worth to the Gospels, which traces the Christology of the primitive Church to illusion, and a criticism which, while freely employing historical principles and methods in dealing with Christian origins, aims at strengthening the foundations of faith, and counteracting the work of the negative critic. A brief glance at some of the great questions that have occupied theological thought during the present generation will illustrate and confirm this statement.

Let us begin at the beginning. It will hardly be disputed that a belief in the organic relation of the two Testaments is essential to our faith as Christians. Unless the Gospels have conveyed a totally wrong impression of actual fact,²

¹ Even so conservative a writer as Professor Orr says, "No one who studies the Old Testament in the light of modern knowledge can help being, to some extent, a Higher Critic, nor is it desirable that he should."² (*Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 9.)

² This is, of course, what modern rationalism is trying its hardest to prove.

we may conclude with certainty that our Lord Himself regarded His work as being in direct and organic connexion with the Old Testament. Was He the victim of self-deception? It is equally certain that the Apostles and their fellow-labourers built upon the foundation of the ancient Scriptures. If they too were deceived, then, however innocently, they deceived the world: the very foundation on which they built is gone; and, with the foundation, must go the superstructure, so far as that superstructure carries with it the Catholic belief as to the person of our Lord.¹

Accordingly, there is a resolute attempt on the part of rationalistic criticism to interpret the Old Testament on a naturalistic basis. The supernatural is excluded; redemptive purpose is denied; revelation, in any true and distinctive sense of the term, is ruled out. It is almost unnecessary to state that such a contention amounts to a denial of any organic relation of the New Testament to the Old. Thus (to take one of the latest examples of this treatment) Professor Nathaniel Schmidt, who is persuaded that the Christology of the Old Testament is a complete delusion, devotes an important chapter² of his learned work, *The Prophet of Nazareth*, to an examination of the supposed Old Testament basis of Christianity. *Seriatim*, he deals with "Messianic passages." Having weighed in the balances of his own judgment the "passages" usually regarded as predictive

¹ "The faith of the Apostles was not a new religion, but a new stage in the old religion of Israel, and it derived a large part of its claims to acceptance from this its appeal to the past in conjunction with the present. The dream of a Christianity without Judaism soon arose, and could not but arise; but, though it could make appeal to a genuine zeal for the purity of the Gospel, it was in effect an abnegation of apostolic Christianity. When robbed of His Messiahship, our Lord became an isolated portent and the true meaning of faith in Him was lost. This was one of the most fundamental subjects of controversy in the second century, and with good reason the watchword of the champions of the apostolic teaching was the harmony of prophets with Apostles." (Hort, *1 Peter*, p. 57.)

² Chapter iii. "The Old Testament Basis."

and found them wanting, he at once draws the conclusion that his point is proved,—namely, that Christ has no place in the Old Testament.¹

The question at once arises, how is this kind of criticism best met? Comparatively few, at the present time, would reply to it altogether on traditional lines as represented by Dr. Keith's *Evidence of Prophecy* and Bishop Wordsworth's *Commentary on the Old Testament*. We turn for help to the critic. True, there has been a certain measure of concession; for we cannot, or certainly do not, place the same reliance as the traditionalist upon particular "passages." Concession, however, does not imply surrender; the concession simply amounts to this,—that the organic relation of the New Testament to the Old is seen to stand more in the spirit than in the letter; "the predictive tone and temper of the whole Jewish history and literature is clearly distinguishable from particular predictions."² Accordingly, we take our stand not so much upon specific predictions (though we are far from setting these contemptuously aside) as upon the unfolding of great ethical and spiritual principles, which find their full expression in the writings of the New Testament,—above all, in the teaching, the character, and the person of Jesus Christ. We appeal, and confidently appeal, to the teleological character of the Old Testament in general, and that of Hebrew history in particular. "Israel has the idea of teleology as a kind of soul."³ The expectant

¹ "Those (passages) mentioned are the most important and have been most widely recognized. Old Testament Christology stands or falls with them" (p. 39). Professor Schmidt finds no predictive element in the Old Testament; still less would he admit the perspective of prophecy. The immediate occasion of any so-called prophetic utterance exhausts, for him, its meaning. Thus, to give an example, he would see the complete fulfilment of Isaiah ix. 1 ff. and xi. 1 ff. in the re-instatement of Jehoiachin, and in the birth of his son Sheshbazzar (p. 47).

² Illingworth, *Reason and Revelation*, p. 136.

³ Dorner, *System of Christian Doctrine* p. 274.

attitude of the Hebrew religion is one of the commonplaces of theology, so that "it is difficult for any candid mind to deny that the spirit of the Old Testament fulfils itself in the New."¹ Moreover, by thus diverting attention, in some measure, from specific to fundamental prophecy—in other words, as we have already said, from the letter to the spirit—a reverent and unprejudiced criticism has vastly strengthened the Church's faith in the Old Testament as a preparation for the fuller, higher teaching of the New. The gain is distinct and great. To-day, to the eye of faith, Jesus Christ stands forth, not so much as doing certain things and saying certain words in order to the exact fulfilment of certain predictions, but rather as the embodiment, the impersonation of fundamental truths, progressively and historically revealed in the earlier dispensation.

We shall be guilty of no digression if we refer briefly to the relation of criticism to the question of progressive revelation, since it has a very important bearing upon our subject. The principle of progressive revelation, which is now accepted almost as a truism, was, within memory, a rock of offence to many educated Christians; nor is it the least of the Church's debts to the critical movement that this stumblingblock no longer exists. There are indeed still those who think to make capital in the interests of infidelity out of the undeveloped morality of the Old Testament;² but, for the educated world, this difficulty has so completely disappeared that it is not easy to realize that it ever existed. Yet many of us can well remember the time when the Church was exposed to the same danger that threatened its very existence during the Gnostic controversy in the second century. There is much, it cannot be questioned, in the

¹ Orr, *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 33.

² Mr. Blatchford, for example, appeals to the masses on this ground. This, as well as Mr. Blatchford's other controversial methods, is conclusively dealt with by Mr. Frank Ballard in his *Clarion Fallacies*.

Old Testament to shock the moral sense trained in the school of the New—much apparently sanctioned by God in the earlier dispensation which Christ could not incorporate in His own teaching.

What explanation could be given of this seeming conflict of ethical principle within the covers of the Bible? Where was the ground of reconciliation? By what principle was the Church enabled to resolve a discord that, for the minds of many, imperilled the organic connexion of the two Testaments so essential to the Christian faith? It was the critic that came to the relief of the Christian conscience by establishing the principle that *the end is the test of revelation*,—that the best of one age is not the best of another,—that the highest of patriarchal or Hebrew life was but a stepping-stone to something better,—that God has educated humanity as He educates the individual,—that as the individual rises on stepping-stones of his dead self, so is it with the race. “At whatever point revelation begins, *it must take man up at the stage at which it finds him*. It must take him up at his existing stage of knowledge and culture, and with his existing social usages and ethical ideas.”¹ The Old Testament, misunderstood from the standpoint of its imperfect morality, was, not fifty years ago, in danger of being set aside as a purely human composition; rightly understood by the aid of historical criticism, we can claim this very feature of development as internal evidence of its divine origin. Nor is there, at the present time, any stronger proof of an inspired Old Testament than this evolutionary, this teleological impress of its contents. The very fact that it conforms itself to the principle of evolution strengthens our faith in its inspiration.² What, however, we have

¹ Orr, *Problem of the Old Testament*, p. 473.

² See Vernon Storr, *Development and Divine Purpose*, p. 12; and cf. Professor H. Drummond (“The Contribution of Science to Christianity,”

specially to note in connexion with our subject is this,—the spirit of modern criticism has thus firmly established the teleological structure of the Old Testament and its organic relation to the New. In so doing, it presents Jesus Christ to us as the more perfect Exponent of the Divine counsel, and directs the eye of faith to Him as the goal and fulfilment of the earlier economy.¹ “The Incarnation is no isolated event: as such its significance might be minimized, its reality questioned. But it stands in the most intimate connexion with that age-long preparation which we see unfolded in the prophetic literature. *Ever since the world began God’s holy prophets had been preparing the way* (Acts iii. 21; Luke i. 70) for the apprehension of this crowning act of God’s mercy and God’s love.”²

We proceed to illustrate the apologetic value of criticism from questions more exclusively connected with the New Testament. Towards the middle of last century, Strauss believed that he had finally invalidated the historicity of the Gospels by assigning to them a date long subsequent to the events which they profess to chronicle, bringing the Synoptics down into the second century, and the Fourth Gospel as late as A.D. 170. There is no greater name than Strauss in the long line of negative critics. But the very foundation on which he built has been withdrawn, and withdrawn by the hand of criticism. The searching inquiry into Christian origins conducted during the last half century has completely discredited the date which the radical criticism of seventy years ago sought to establish; and we may now, without fear of serious contradiction, place

EXPOSITOR, ser. iii. vol. i. p. 103 ff.), who points out the debt that theology owes to the theory of evolution in elucidating and interpreting the principle of progressive revelation.

¹ Rom. x. 4.

² Edghill, *Evidential Value of Prophecy*, p. 597.

the Synoptics in the third quarter of the first century (A.D. 65-85).¹

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this decisive verdict of the higher criticism.² Accept Strauss's date of the Gospels, and you go a long way towards surrendering their authenticity; and with that virtually goes the historical portrait of Jesus Christ. That we should do so is the deliberate aim of the negative critic. To destroy the credibility of the Christian tradition is as much the object of Professors Schmiedel and Schmidt to-day as it was Strauss's in the middle of last century. And as with Strauss, so with his modern representatives; they cannot be encountered by bare denial; they must be met by argument and proof; critic must be met by critic. In this particular instance it will be seen that the value of criticism can be best expressed in terms of the value of an historic faith.

It cannot be said that criticism has done for the Fourth Gospel all that it has done for the Synoptics; but its efforts

¹ There are eminent scholars who maintain that the Gospel of St. Luke was written before A.D. 60. The question is of course intimately connected with the date of the Acts. See Dr. Dawson Walker, *Gift of Tongues and other Essays*, p. 217 ff.

² Professor Harnack, whose latest work so strongly confirms the Lucan authorship, and therefore early date, of the third Gospel, will not admit that this makes it the more historically trustworthy (*Lukas der Arzt*, p. 113). To this Professor Ramsay replies: "These are not the words of a dispassionate historian; they are the words of one whose mind is made up *a priori*, and who strains the facts to suit his preconceived opinion. In no department of historical criticism except Biblical would any scholar dream of saying, or dare to say, that accounts are not more trustworthy if they can be traced back to authors who were children at the time the events which form this subject occurred, and who were in year-long, confidential and intimate relations with actors in those events, than they would be if they were composed by writers one or two generations younger, who had personal acquaintance with few or none of the actors and contemporaries" (*EXPOSITOR*, December, 1906, p. 504). Cf. the following: "It would most unquestionably be an argument of decisive weight in favour of the Biblical history, could it indeed be shown that it was written by eye-witnesses, or even by persons nearly contemporaneous with the events narrated" (Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, 4th edn., p. 55).

have been far from fruitless. At the least it has succeeded in showing that Strauss was in error ; and although there are scholars who would still bring the Gospel down as late as A.D. 140, there is now a general tendency to place it in the first century. With regard to its origin and history, opinion is as yet much divided, but the evidence for the Johannine authorship has been much strengthened since the days of Strauss and Baur by the work of a great band of scholars, English, Continental and American.¹

The history of criticism, as it has affected the writings of St. Paul, affords another illustration of our subject. At the present time, of all the witnesses to the primitive Christian tradition, the Pauline Epistles take the foremost place. But it is well to remember that the outstanding prominence of this particular branch of Christian evidence is due to the attempt, just referred to, to “dissolve the life of Jesus into a mythology.” Strauss himself hardly concealed the fact that he sought to establish a late date for the Gospels for the purpose of attacking their authenticity. It was not long, however, before critics as learned as himself, but less ready to part with their faith, showed Strauss that he had elaborated his theory irrespective of any evidence but that which the Gospels themselves supplied, and that he had never really faced the fact that, within a few years of the death of Christ, the Christian faith, *based on events recorded in the Gospels*, had been very widely disseminated. To this fact the Pauline Epistles are our most important witness ; and the most complete refutation of the mythical theory—advocated by Strauss, abandoned by his successors, but revived in somewhat altered guise in our own day—is to be found in

¹ Conspicuous amongst these are Bishops Lightfoot and Westcott, Drs. Sanday and Salmon, Archdeacon Watkins, W. H. Hutton ; H. and P. Ewald, B. Weiss, W. Beyschlag, F. Gode t ; Drs. Ezra Abbott and James Drummond, the two last writing from the Unitarian standpoint.

those writings. These letters, some of which were written several years before the earliest of the Gospels, are based upon the selfsame facts and teaching that are recorded by the Evangelists. They form the most cogent proof that we could have that the Catholic faith was not the product of imperfect, and even distorted, recollection,—that the Church was not built upon a Christ whose real characteristics had almost faded from memory. These letters embody, incidentally and allusively (just as we should expect in epistolary documents), the main features of the Gospel: they reproduce much of the recorded teaching of Christ; they contain the clearest possible proof that the writer's belief was, substantially, no other than that of the Apostles and other eye-witnesses. More conclusive evidence against the mythical hypothesis, in any shape or form, could hardly be desired.

But these Epistles of St. Paul have themselves been the subject of a fierce critical controversy which is not yet closed. The Pauline authorship of all but the four great Epistles (constituting the *Hauptbriefe* of German theologians), Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians, was called in question by the Tübingen school in the middle of last century. The position of these four was regarded as unassailable even by Baur and his disciples, but that of the rest was denied or disputed by the majority of Continental scholars. From the standpoint of faith, few chapters of the critical history of New Testament writings are more encouraging than the one which tells how the disputed Epistles have won their way back to a place amongst St. Paul's acknowledged works. To-day, as the result of this great critical struggle, the only Epistles whose claim to be genuine is seriously or widely disputed are the Pastoral Epistles and the Ephesians,—that of the latter much less generally and confidently than was the case a few years ago.

We cannot pass from our notice of the Pauline Epistles without touching upon the recent attack on the Hauptbriefe. Even these, which the radicalism of Tübingen had left to St. Paul, have had to run the gauntlet of criticism; and this avowedly because, if genuine, they afford unimpeachable witness to the historicity of Jesus Christ. In this revolutionary proceeding a Dutch theologian, Dr. Loman, led the way nearly a quarter of a century ago. Having adopted the view that Christianity was no more than a Messianic movement, and that Jesus Christ was a symbolic, not an historic, figure, it was indispensable to his hypothesis that the whole of the Pauline literature should be set aside as unauthentic. This position he maintained by the most arbitrary methods. In the main features of his contention Dr. Loman has been followed by a few extremists, chiefly of his own nationality; but by a vast majority of critics, of all shades of opinion, these views have been summarily dismissed as amongst the eccentricities of criticism. Even, however, for the most extravagant conclusions plausible arguments may be used, which can only be effectually met by solid learning; the most "utterly perverse and untenable arguments"¹ will take root in congenial soil, unless definitely disproved. The defence, therefore, of the Pauline authorship even of the Hauptbriefe is in the hands of the critic; and there with perfect confidence we may leave it.²

We pass to another conspicuous debt which the Church owes to the critical movement. One result of that move-

¹ So Bishop Gore characterizes the reasoning of Dr. Loman's school (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 248).

² Dr. Loman's views were at once strenuously opposed by two of the most famous, and at the same time advanced, critics of the day—critics moreover of Dr. Loman's own nationality—Professor A. Kuenen and Dr. Scholten. The subject is dealt with by Canon Knowling in *The Witness of the Epistles* and in *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*. See also Dr. Lock, *The Authenticity of St. Paul's Epistles*. (Church Congress Report, 1904.)

ment has been to throw fresh light upon every part and every aspect of the New Testament,—above all upon the person of our Lord, and upon His life in the flesh. Anything that enables us to visualize Him in His earthly sojourn, anything that removes artificiality, anything that makes Him more real, anything that lights up His sayings and doings, is so much gain to the Church. It would be difficult to exaggerate the gain that has actually thus accrued from the labours of the critic. When we compare all that was understood fifty years ago of what may be termed the “setting” of our Lord’s portrait in the Gospels with what is known to-day; when we note the confirmation that modern research has brought to historical and geographical details in the New Testament writings;¹ when we think of the exact and vivid picture which the later learning has placed before us of Christ’s social, intellectual, religious and political environment, we can realize something of what we owe to the critical spirit of our own day.

This debt of gratitude is a manifold one: it might be approached from many sides; but the great achievement of criticism from the standpoint of faith is the realism with which it has invested the story of the Evangelists—a realism which brings us face to face with the great Subject of whom they write, making Him live and speak and act before our very eyes. “The whole Jewish world is there,” says Dr. Fairbairn, “a compact, coherent, living world, which we can re-articulate, revivify and visualize.”² Again, “All is

¹ Doubtless many chronological and historical difficulties still await explanation; as, for example, the enrolment under Quirinius (Luke ii. 2), the death of Zachariah, the son of Barachiah (Matt. xxiii. 35), and the apparent chronological discrepancies suggested by comparing the synoptic account of the Passion with that of the Fourth Gospel. It is, however, beyond dispute that the general historical trustworthiness of the New Testament has been remarkably confirmed by modern inquiry. The same may be said in regard to geographical and topographical details.

² *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. 386.

presented with the utmost realism, so grouped round the central figure as to form a perfect historical picture, *He* and His *setting* being so built together as to constitute a single organic whole.”¹

Now this convincing realism of the Gospels—this striking internal evidence of their historicity—is, to a very great extent, the fruit of the critical spirit. The historical criticism, which has done so much to make the personalities of the Old Testament real and living, has done the same for the New Testament ; above all, it has clothed the personality of Jesus Christ with a new power. To those who humbly and reverently approach the Gospels, He is not less Divine than He was to our fathers, but He is more truly and naturally human ; He is not less the Saviour, but He is more experimentally the Elder Brother. By apprehending so much better than we once did Christ’s relation to His contemporaries, we better understand His relation to all time and to the human race. As we read the commentaries on the Gospels and the “Lives of Christ” written for past generations, do we not feel that our Lord’s humanity was more than half hidden behind theological conceptions of His person ? True, St. Paul desired no more to “know Christ after the flesh,” but the Pauline presentation of Christ and His work is carried too far, if it diverts our thoughts from His life upon earth as depicted in the Gospels. It is there that we find Him sharing our lot, sympathizing with our infirmities, facing our trials, leading us in the narrow way that brings to the full fruition of God, revealing to the world the true worth and work and destiny of man.

Criticism is, as we have seen, an instrument that works opposite effects according to the hand that holds it. As employed by the rationalist, it encourages doubt and accentuates difficulties ; as used by the believer, it reassures and

¹ *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. 329.

enriches the Church. Working, not always, not indeed often, upon traditional lines, the believing critic has vastly strengthened our conviction that, in the Gospels, we are face to face with a Christ that created the Church, not a Christ that the Church created,—that the Evangelists have handed down, not cunningly devised fables, not literary products of illusion, but the record of a life that was really lived, of words that were really spoken, of a Messianic consciousness that had a real existence, of miracles, moreover, that were actually wrought.

We are thus led, in conclusion, to a very brief consideration of the miracles of the New Testament. In no department, perhaps, of theological thought has the constructive, as opposed to the destructive, aspect of criticism been better exemplified than in its dealing with miracles alleged by New Testament writers to have been wrought by our Lord and His Apostles. Rationalism, on *a priori* grounds, rules the miraculous out of its creed. But to those who accept the Incarnation as the fundamental truth of their belief, a non-miraculous Christianity is a contradiction in terms. It is, perhaps, true that, in his defence of miracle, the critic has not greatly reduced the intellectual difficulty of the subject: at the same time he has done *something* to meet the *a priori* attitude of negation adopted by the science of forty years ago, and *much* to bring out the significant contrast between the miracles that attended the birth of Christianity and the portents of ecclesiastical history and legend—a contrast which, as it vindicates the reasonableness, so lessens the inherent improbability, of New Testament miracle.

But the critical movement has surely done more than this. By fastening attention upon the person of Christ, it has paved the way for an honest and rational acceptance of the miraculous. Once realize, as the critic has helped us to do, the unique personality of our Lord,—and, since unique

personality is suggestive of unique experience, a serious barrier to belief in the miraculous is removed.¹ We have, in this way, been led to correlate the miracles of the New Testament with the person of Christ; we see them to be, "like Jesus Himself, supernatural, but not contra-natural";² we contemplate them rather as signs (*σημεία*) than as wonders (*τέρατα*); we see in them a revelation of Christ Himself rather than of His power; they are acts of redemption, and thus signs of His kingdom. The miracles may not, indeed, be defended to-day with exactly the same weapons that Archdeacon Paley, or even Professor Mozley, used; their treatment³ has not escaped the scientific and critical temper of the age; but their inner meaning, their spiritual and eternal import, has been more fully apprehended and interpreted; their congruity, not only with Christ's life and teaching as presented in the Gospels, but also with the Church's persistent faith as to His person, has been placed in a clearer and more convincing light.

Meanwhile, in regard to the greatest of New Testament miracles, the miracle of the Resurrection, criticism, if it has done nothing more, has exposed the unreasonableness of rationalism in its self-contradictory attempts to explain away what, apart from the Church's solution, is inexplicable. Whilst the negative criticism has put forward first one hypothesis, then another,—starting new theories only to abandon them and go back to old ones, not knowing its own mind, but always denying the possibility of that which cannot be proved impossible—it has never been allowed a

¹ "We regard the miracles of Christ as unique manifestations of His unique personality" (Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, p. 119). This view of the subject applies with special force to the Virgin-birth.

² Fairbairn, *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. 336.

³ This is well shown in Dr. Sanday's treatment of the subject in his *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 101 ff. On the naturalness and congruity of our Lord's miracles, see Fairbairn, *u.s.*; Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, p. 88 ff.; Bishop Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 46 ff.

moment's pause ; it has been pursued, challenged, cross-questioned, and found wanting by the critic who is not prepared to put a naturalistic interpretation on the origin of Christianity, or trace the rise of the Christian Church to an illusion.

Those who are acquainted with the literature of the subject can appreciate the debt which the Church owes to criticism in regard to this vital question. But for the work of the critic, rationalism, even if not quite satisfied with one or other of its theories, might have rested in the conviction that there are various *possible* non-miraculous explanations. This, however, as hypothesis after hypothesis has been critically examined only to be discredited, has become increasingly difficult ; and certain it is that scepticism has lost much of its self-confidence in dealing with this mystery. To what extent the efforts of the critic in bringing about this situation have been assisted by the results of psychical research it would be hard to say ; perhaps more than orthodoxy is quite ready to admit. However this may be, there is at the present time a disposition to give up the problem as insoluble, and take refuge with Baur in a candid confession of ignorance. Rationalism will continue to treat the Resurrection as " a fact of psychology rather than of the visible world,"¹ and to maintain that " the empty grave offers a problem which objective history can never solve " ;² at the same time, it is forced to confess that " the Resurrection, when approached from the side of historical criticism, offers as great difficulties as when approached from the side of Christian belief." ³ It may be added that the voluminous modern literature of the subject affords a good illustration of the

¹ Dr. Gardner, *Historic View of the New Testament*, p. 162.

² Dr. Gardner, *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 258.

³ *Ibid.* p. 255.

fact that, whatever the difficulties of faith, those of unbelief are greater.

Did time permit, we might pursue the main contention of this paper into the region of comparative religion, and show that the questions (now much under discussion) which arise as to the originality and independence of the Christian religion must be left to those who bring to their task the trained skill of the controversialist as well as the ripe learning of the scholar.

Enough, however, has been said to demonstrate the fact that critic must be met by critic; the higher critic, who would subvert the very foundations of Catholic Christianity, by the higher critic, who holds fast to fundamental truth; in other words, destructive criticism must be met by constructive criticism. Enough, we hope, has been said to show that nothing could be more suicidal than to denounce the higher critic as a foe to faith. Our contention, on the contrary, is that the Church to-day can only fight her battles with the aid of the higher criticism. The rationalistic interpreter, for example, of the Gospels must be met on his own ground and with his own weapons. What does the ordinary reader of the New Testament know about the critical apparatus with which negation works out its revolutionary conclusions? It is not in the province of the amateur to pronounce upon alleged interpolations, marginal glosses, early misinterpretations, later additions, doctrinal enlargements, editorial emendations, and other possible factors, which play so large a part in the work of disintegration. Again, it requires the knowledge of the expert to bring a forced and artificial treatment of the New Testament face to face with its own inconsistencies, or to demonstrate in detail the bias that will sacrifice any portion of the text to preconceived opinion.

Considering the infinite importance of the truths at stake,

one can hardly be too cautious in dealing with the subject, or too much on one's guard against hastily accepting hypotheses and opinions as if they were assured results of criticism ; but no greater mistake could be made than to disparage the critical movement and ignore its contributions to the cause of truth. The nervous alarm sometimes displayed in the presence of the higher critic inevitably creates an impression that faith fears the light, and deprecates the spirit of inquiry,—an impression which cannot fail to play into the hand of the sceptic. If, in these days, we are to prove all things and hold fast that which is good, we must not shrink from examining, beneath the light of criticism, the historic foundations of our faith ; they will bear the strongest searchlight that can be turned upon them ; and we may rest assured, to quote the words of a recent writer, that “ the foundations of Biblical authority lie far beneath the historical and literary structure of the documents, and that the revision of historical and literary opinion, far from unsettling faith in revelation, tends to purge that faith of fear and doubt, and to advance it into the region of certitude.”¹

G. S. STREATFIELD.

¹ Cuthbert Hall, D.D., *Universal Elements of the Christian Religion*, p. 249.

*THE DEMONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT,
ILLUSTRATED BY PSALM XCI.*

IN Rabbinical literature this psalm is called שִׁיר שֶׁל פְּנֵעִים, and its use in the event of demoniacal encounters is recommended.¹ There must have been something particularly appropriate about the psalm to have occasioned such a recommendation. Its late date,² certainly post-exilic, is of importance from the point of view of our present investigation, for the influence of Babylonian thought upon the exiles was, it is well known, very marked; and it is in the highest degree probable that this influence was as strong in the domain of popular demonology as in any other direction. There is reason to believe³ that from the earliest times the Israelites had an extensive demonology, of a popular kind, which was the common property of the Semitic race; so that when Babylonian influence began once more,⁴ during the Exile, to be exercised upon the captives, there was very probably a fertile soil ready to receive any new seed which eastern winds might blow towards it. This, added to the fact that the thoroughly established Monotheism of post-exilic times had to a great extent eliminated the danger of demon cults, would mainly account for the more fully developed and officially recognized demonology of later Judaism.⁵

Now one of the most marked characteristics of all systems

¹ E.g. *Shebuoth*, 15b.

² Cf. Briggs, *Psalms* (Internat. Crit. Com.), I. pp. xc., xci., who assigns it to the "Early Greek" period.

³ See *EXPOSITOR*, April, 1907, pp. 318 ff.

⁴ It will be remembered that in much earlier times Babylonian influence, as is proved by the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, had been immense.

⁵ Persia and Greece, of course, also contributed their quota; see the articles by F. C. Conybeare already referred to, *EXPOSITOR*, April, 1907, p. 317.

of demonology is the use of formulas, incantations and the like, for the purpose of counteracting or rendering nugatory the evil machinations of demons; the number of "magic" texts of Babylonia that have been recovered is very large.¹ One or two extracts from these will not be inappropriate here. The following is addressed to a demon :

As long as thou dost not stir from the body of the man, the son of his god, as long as thou dost not budge, thou shalt eat no food neither drink water; the goblet of Bel, the father that bore thee, halt thou not touch with thy hand, neither shalt thou be covered with water from the sea, nor with sweet water, nor with bitter water, nor with water from the Tigris, nor with water from the Euphrates, nor with well-water, nor with water from a river. When thou desirest to fly to the heavens thy wings will refuse (their office) . . .²

Or again :

I call upon you, ye gods of the night, with you I call upon the night, the veiled bride, I call at eventide, at midnight, at early dawn.³

The Jews also had various means of exorcising demons; among others was that recommended by Rashi: "If a demon hears his name pronounced (repeatedly), each time with a syllable less, he will flee"; an example which he gives is the name of the demon Shabiri, which had to be called out thus :—

Shabiri, abiri, biri, ri.⁴

Another formula was: "The Lord rebuke thee" (cf. Zech. iii. 2).

Under Babylonian influence, it can scarcely be doubted, many formulas were used by the Jews for the purpose of driving away demons; this was, however, as we shall see, not by any means the only method of combating them,

¹ Jastrow, ch. xvi.

² OW. 34.

³ Jastrow, 287. For a Greek example, see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 23 ff.

⁴ FW. 257.

for, on Arabian and Babylonian analogy,¹ it is permissible to infer that there were certain classes of both men and women to whom recourse was had for helping the victims of what were believed to be demoniacal onslaughts.

The theory, then, with regard to the ninety-first psalm, which the following pages will attempt to justify, is that it is a polemic, in devotional form, against current methods of securing oneself against demons. The psalmist undoubtedly believed in demons and their works; his ideas regarding them were in agreement—so the psalm itself seems to teach—with the popular beliefs of his day; where he disagreed *in toto* from these was in the methods which were supposed to be efficacious in shielding oneself from the malicious activity of the demons. Not in formulas and enchantments, not by means of wizards and witches, but only with the help, and under the protection of Jahwe was there any real security from the curse of demons.

Verse 1.

יֵשֵׁב בְּסִטֵּר עָלָיו בְּצֵל שְׁדֵי יִתְלוֹן :

He that abideth under the protection of the Most High, passes the night in the shadow of Shaddai.

The point of importance here is that the root לן means "to pass the night" (cf. e.g. Gen. xix. 2, Judg. xix. 13, 14, 2 Sam. xvii. 16). Now, as already pointed out, it was especially at night-time that the demon's power was supposed to be greatest, and consequently their activity most pronounced. The Arabs believed that after dark was the time during which demons were about, and that their activity continued until the morning-star rose.² The Babylonians said, for example, that the "Wicked Seven" are so powerful at nights that they are even able to oppress

¹ Cf. EXPOSITOR, June, 1907, pp. 535-537.

² Wellh. 151.

the moon, until the rising sun comes to her help.¹ In a Babylonian hymn it is said that the rising sun drives away all evil spirits.² Another hymn describes how Shamash, the Sun-god, proceeds at morn from the great mountain of the east, and bans with his bright rays all the murky demons who frolic during the hours of darkness. So, too, in Rabbinical literature; the solitary wanderer at night is in special danger of demons,³ and, according to *Bereshith rabba*, c. 36, the time for demons is from dusk till cock-crowing, during this time they will surround a house and harm any one who comes out; and they will kill children who are out after dark.⁴

It is possible that in the phrase **בצל שדי** there is a covert reference to the "darkness of Shaddai (the Almighty)," i.e. the darkness wherein, according to the true believer, *Jahwe* is all-powerful, as contrasted with the darkness of the demons, i.e. the darkness wherein, according to the popular fallacy, the demons are supreme; at all events, the root idea of **צלל** is "to be dark." Then, again, it is perhaps not fanciful to see in **שדי** a word-play; one of the most prominent figures in Babylonian demonology was the bull-shaped *Shedu*; in Jewish demonology one of the main categories into which demons are divided is that of the **שדים** (*Shedim*), whose leader is Asmedai (Asmodeus, cf. Tobit iii. 8, 17); they exist in great numbers, they have wings, and are active at nights, especially in the wilderness, though their presence is not confined to the desert; according to one account, they were originally serpents, and by a process of evolution became *Shedim* (*Baba Kamma*, 16a).⁵ It is, therefore, possible that in "Shaddai" a word-play

¹ OW. 10.

² Jeremias, *Das A.T. im Lichte des alten Orients*, pp. 35, 342.

³ *Pesachim*, 112b.

⁴ FW. 255.

⁵ FW. 254.

was intended. It is, of course, not suggested that there is any radical connexion between *Shaddai* and *Shedim*; similarity of sound was quite sufficient for those word-plays which so frequently occur in the biblical books.

Verse 2.

אָמַר לַיהוָה מִחֶסֶד וּמִצְדָּתַי אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתַי-בּוֹ :

*That saith*¹ *to Jahwe*, “*My refuge and my defence, my God*”; *in Him do I trust.*

The stress is laid here on *Jahwe*, because it was just this trust in *Him* that formed the contrast to the popular method of securing oneself against demons.

These popular methods have already been referred to; but some little detail is necessary here. Among the Babylonians there was a regular class of priests called “*mash-mashu*,”² whose special calling it was to ban demons when they had taken possession of a man, or were injuring him in any way. It was to these priests that men fled for refuge and defence in their terror, believing that the ban-formula or incantation which the priests prescribed was all-sufficient. Nor are we without definite proof that something of the same kind existed among the Jews. The following passages will show this: in Isaiah xlvii. 9, 12, in the first place, we read of sorceries and enchantments prevalent among the Babylonians, showing that these methods were known of in Palestine; but that they were, indeed, also prevalent among the Israelites both before and after the Exile is clear from these passages: Micah v. 12 (11 in Hebrew): *And I will cut off witchcrafts out of thine hand; and thou shalt have no more soothsayers*; Deuteronomy

¹ So the *Septuagint* (*επει*); the opening word of the psalm, יִטַּב, presupposes some word like אִשְׁרֵי, which very likely preceded it originally; cf. Ps. i. 1.

² OW. 7.

xviii. 10, 11 : *There shall not be found with thee . . . one that useth divination, one that practiseth augury, or an enchanter, or a sorcerer, or a charmer, or a consulter with a familiar spirit, or a wizard, or a necromancer ;* Jeremiah xxvii. 9 : *Hearken ye not to your prophets, nor to your diviners, nor to your dreams, nor to your soothsayers, nor to your sorcerers . . . ;* cf. also Nahum iii. 4, Numbers xxiii. 23, xxiv. 1, Malachi iii. 5, Wisdom xii. 4-6.¹ It is, therefore, extremely likely that there was much the same practice in Judaea as in Babylonia ; namely, that there was a class of men (priests), to whom people went for help when attacked, as they supposed, by demons. If this is so, then the verse before us may well have been the psalmist's expression of the blessedness of those who, like himself, looked to *Jahwe* for help and defence, instead of to the men in whom his less enlightened fellows trusted when assailed by evil powers.

Verse 3.

כִּי הוּא יִצִּילְךָ מִפֶּחַ יְקוּשׁ :

For He shall deliver thee from the net of the fowler.

The emphatic הוּא, ("He") recalls what was said above about the emphasis on *Jahwe*. It must be confessed that it is not altogether easy to see where the danger lies for *men* in a fowler's net ; the פֶּחַ was only a small net, it was not like the רֶשֶׁת, which was a large net spread over the ground (cf. Ps. ix. 15) ; generally speaking, however, it is used figuratively of the plots or evil machinations of men, but in the whole passage there is little or nothing to show that the evils from which protection is given are the works of evil-disposed men ; the parallel clause of this verse speaks of the "noisome pestilence" (though on this see below), and later on there is mention of "the terror by night,"

¹ See, further, EXPOSITOR, June, 1907, pp. 537-540.

“ the arrow that flieth by day,” the “ pestilence that walketh in darkness,” “ the destruction that wasteth at noonday,” and so on throughout the psalm ; these (even the “ arrow ” that flieth by day, see below) are all things very far removed from anything in the shape of plots or the like on the part of *men* ; the one exception is verse 8, which speaks of “ the reward of the wicked,” but it will be allowed that the psalm reads equally smoothly if this verse is omitted ; upon the interpretation of the psalm here offered verse 8 did not belong to it in its original form, because it disturbs the context. But, whether the interpretation is right or wrong, it is interesting to see that Prof. Briggs in his *Commentary*,¹ the second volume of which has just been published, regards this verse as due to a glossator, though on quite different grounds from those here set forth. If, however, פֶּסֶל in verse 3 refers to some demoniacal craft, then its use is distinctly significant here ; for in this connexion it is interesting to recall the fact that according to both Arabian and Babylonian belief there was a very close relationship between demons and witches ; the Arabs held that witches were in the incarnations of demons ;² the Babylonians believed them to be just as dangerous as demons, indeed, according to Babylonian belief, the two were often in league with one another, and played into each other’s hands, and both enchanters and witches had the power of impressing demons into their service.³ Death follows in the trail of a witch, so ran the belief ; her eyes and feet and hands were all quicker and more mobile than those of ordinary men and women ; like demons, the witches took up their abode in forsaken sites ; when a witch spies a victim, the Babylonians taught, she follows

¹ Vol. ii. pp. 280 ff.

² Wellh. 159.

³ See further, *EXPOSTOR*, June, 1907, pp. 535 f.

him, entangles his feet in her net and drags him to the ground.¹ Most of all she loves to be active at night-time ; and she is known as the "Huntress of the night."²

It will be conceded that these facts are significant (see further below), for if these kind of ideas were current at the time in Judaea as well as in Babylonia—and there is every reason to suppose that this was the case—then our psalmist must have known of them, and they must have been in his mind when he wrote the psalm.

; מִדְּבַר (מִדְּבַר ?) הַיּוֹת ; *From the destructive word* (R.V. "From the noisome pestilence"). This rendering is based on the *Septuagint* version, ἀπὸ λόγου . . . , all the great MSS. concurring, the Syriac and Symmachus. It is true that this rendering does not, *at first sight*, suit the parallel clause, "the net of the fowler" ; but this is true also of the Massoretic text. But possibly there is more justification for the *Septuagint* rendering than appears at first sight ; at all events, according to the present method of interpreting the psalm, the Greek gives good sense and affords a perfect parallel to the other clause of the verse. Just as there were certain classes of men to whom, as we have seen, people went when they believed themselves to be oppressed by a demon, and just as these men professed to break the power of demons by means of written formulas, magical incantations, charms and the like,—so there were other classes, comprising both men and women, who were believed to be in league with demons and who could harm people by using spells and practising certain unhallowed rites, whereby they forced demons to do injury, to cause sickness, and even to bring about death. We have already referred to the close connexion believed to exist between

¹ These are the actual expressions.

² Cf. Rabisu, the "Lurker," who is an important figure in Babylonian demonology.

demons and witches ; these latter almost take up an intermediate position between human beings and demons in the Babylonian system. Professor Jastrow says : “ No sharp distinction is made between the living magician or witch and the various demons who flit about like ghosts or carry on their machinations in invisible form. . . . For this reason it happens that in the same adjuration a witch and a demon are addressed indiscriminately. And since one cannot know for a certainty which particular demon is at work, it is customary to name various categories of them. In the same way it may happen that the witch who is causing trouble is wholly unknown, and may be taking every means to remain so.”¹ In such cases a form of adjuration is used which has a general application, whether in reference to demons generally, or witches in general, or to both (see the extract below). Difficult as it is for us to realize the fact, it is nevertheless important to remember that the beliefs regarding the power for harm that witches had constituted a terrible reality and must have been a constant source of fear and anxiety ; one has only to read some of the immense numbers of magic texts, and the like, to realize how deeply people must have felt upon the subject, and what a terrible curse upon the community generally must have been the belief in these ubiquitous demons and their allies in human form. The following is an interesting example of a Babylonian adjuration pronounced against some unknown witch who was believed to be entangling her victim, with the help, of course, of a demon :

Who art thou, enchantress, that carries in her heart the evil word
 against me,
 Upon whose tongue was destruction against me ;
 Through whose lips I have been poisoned,
 In the train of whose footsteps death follows ?
 Enchantress, I grasp thy mouth, I grasp thy tongue,

¹ Jastrow, 309.

I grasp thy piercing eyes,
 I grasp thy ever mobile feet,
 I grasp thy ever active knees,
 I grasp thy ever outstretched hands,
 I bind thy hands behind thee.
 May Sin (i.e. the Moon-god) destroy thy body,
 May he cast thee into an abyss of water and fire !
 Enchantress, like the setting of this signet ring
 May thy face glow and then grow pale !

The last line refers to the melting and getting cool again of the gold.¹ It is clear enough from this typical extract that a spell was believed to have been pronounced, and that the adjuration was recited for the purpose of counter-acting the evil effects of the word of occult magic. It is conceivable that in the verse before us the psalmist was referring to something of this kind ; its meaning would then be that Jahwe, and nobody else, could deliver men from the magic spell (" word ") of magician, witch or demon.

Verse 4.

בְּאַבְרָתוֹ יִסְדֵּךְ לְךָ וּבַחַת־כְּנָפָיו תִּחְסֶה :

With His pinion He covers thee, yea, under His wings thou findest refuge.

The protective care of Jahwe is again emphasized ; the thought of finding safety under His wings occurs several times in the Psalms (xvii. 8, xxxvi. 7, lvii. 1, lxi. 4, lxiii. 7) ; it echoes possibly an ancient conception. Quite conceivably a covert contrast is intended between the protecting wings of Jahwe and those which some kinds of demons were believed to have ; the demons used their wings to fly swiftly on their harmful errands, but under Jahwe's wings the terror-stricken would be safe.

צָנָה וְסִחָרָה אֱמֶתוֹ ;

A shield and a buckler is His truth (or " faithfulness ").

¹ Ibid. 309.

The fact that the psalmist uses figurative language suggests that the foes to be shielded against are not men, but spiritual enemies. In the *Midrash* one of the comments on these words runs: "Rabbi Simeon ben Jochai said, 'The weapon which the Holy One, Blessed be He, gave to the Israelites at Sinai was described with the unutterable Name of God.'" ¹ The Holy Name (pronounced Adonai) is elsewhere referred to as a means of safeguard against evil powers; thus, the reading of the *Shema*, because it contains the name of God in the first verse, is recommended for this purpose (*Berachoth*, 5a); the priest's blessing, also because it mentions God's name, is efficacious.

Verse 5.

לֹא־תִירָא מִפֶּחַד לַיְלָה מִחֵץ יְעוֹף יוֹמָם :

Thou shalt not be afraid because of the night-terror or because of the arrow that flieth by day.

To what does this "Night-terror" refer? In the *Midrash* we have this interesting comment: "Rabbi Berechja said, 'There is a harmful spirit that flies like a bird and shoots like an arrow.'" According to Jewish teaching *Lilith*, the Night-hag, got her name from *layilah*, "night"; the etymology was false, but that does not affect the belief that *Lilith* was the night-demon *par excellence*. The connexion was suggested by the similarity of the two words, as well as by the fact that *Lilith* was believed to be especially active at nights. On the assumption that Jewish belief in demons was profoundly influenced by that of Babylonia, it will be instructive to inquire as to the popular Babylonian belief concerning *Lilith*, especially as it is more than probable that she was worshipped by the

¹ *Midrash Tehillim*. . ins Deutsche übersetzt, von A. Wünsche, ii. 68. (Trier, 1892.)

Jewish exiles in Babylon.¹ A demon-triad is formed by Lilu, Lilitu and Ardat Lili; the male, the female, and the handmaid; the biblical Lilith would correspond to the second of these, Lilitu. These three are more particularly storm-demons, who rush about at night seeking what harm they can do to men; they are spoken of as flying, and were therefore most likely, though not necessarily, conceived of as having wings; Ardat Lili is once spoken of as "flitting in through a window" after a man, and she was believed to inflame evil passions; sleeplessness and nightmare were regarded as her handiwork.² A magical text which probably refers to Ardat Lili is quoted by Jastrow, it is so appropriate that part of it may be quoted here:—

The entangler of those that entangle,
 The enchantress of those that enchant,
 Whose net lies spread out in the streets,
 Whose eyes peer about in the open spaces of the city,
 Among them am I, at whom she makes a dead set;
 She surrounds the maidens in the city,
 Among them am I . . .
 May thy evil mouth be filled with dust,
 May thy evil tongue be bound with thongs
 At the command of Marduk, the Lord of Life.³

That the demon Lilitu was not unknown in Israel is clear from Isaiah xxxiv. 14. But it is in the later Jewish beliefs, especially as found stereotyped in Rabbinical literature, that the importance of Lilith appears; for, as we have seen reason to believe, this later literature reflects earlier thought. Here she appears as the head of one of the three great classes into which the demons (*Mazzikin*—"Harm-doers") are divided, viz. the *Lilin*, who take their name from her. They are of human shape, but they have wings;

¹ See Levy in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, ix. 470 ff.

² Jastrow, 278 ff.

³ *Ibid.* 319. An illustration of an Assyrian demon which may well have been a representation of Lilitu is given in Jeremias, p. 342.

they are all females; children are the main objects of their wrath. Lilith is conceived of as a beautiful woman, with long flowing hair;¹ she is dangerous to men, and it is especially at nights, though not exclusively so, that she comes out to seek her victims. These few details will be sufficient for our purpose; they certainly afford some grounds for the supposition that the "Night-terror" was this female demon Lilith. This idea is strengthened by the fact that, according to Jewish tradition, the meteor-stone was called "the arrow of Lilith."²

Verse 6.

מִדְּבַר בְּאֶפֶל יְהִלֶּךָ :

[Or] *because of the pestilence that goeth about in darkness.*

Although in the Massoretic text here there is no ambiguity about דְּבַר, as in verse 3, the *Septuagint* again differs, and as before, renders it as though it were דְּבַר, translating it by its secondary meaning, viz. ἀπὸ πράγματος; in this verse, however, there is no reason for rendering the word otherwise than by "pestilence." And here one is reminded of the well-known Babylonian pest-demon, Namtar. He is often spoken of as the "violent Namtar,"³ and he comes as the pest-bringing envoy from the realms of the dead, like a "raging wind." The following short extract from one of the magical texts shows how he must have been feared :

Terrible Namtar, strong Namtar! Namtar, who will not leave men; Namtar, who will not go away; Namtar, who will not depart; wicked Namtar. . . .⁴

Significant, too, is the introduction to another text describing the action of this "Demon of pestilence" :

¹ Cf. "Frau Holde" in Teutonic myth.

² *Gittin*, 69b, quoted in the *Jewish Encycl.* viii. 88.

³ See, e.g., Jastrow, 350.

⁴ *Ibid.* 369.

Wicked Namtur, who scorches the land like fire, who approaches a man like Asakku, who rages through the wilderness like a storm-wind, who pounces upon a man like a robber, who plagues a man like the pestilence, who has no hands, no feet, who goes about at night. . . .¹

Here, it cannot be denied, we have a forcible reminder of the very words of the psalm, *the pestilence that goeth about in darkness*. That pestilence, and sickness of every kind, was due to the action of demons was likewise, as we have already seen, believed by the Arabs; it was also the teaching of later Judaism.² The latter half of this verse is very instructive:—

יְשׁוּד [וְשִׁד] זְהָרִים; מִקֶּטֶב; [Or] *because of Keteb and the mid-day demon*.

This rendering will be explained in a moment. The word “Keteb,” usually translated “destruction,” only occurs elsewhere three times (Deut. xxxii. 24, Isa. xxviii. 2, Hos. xiii. 14), and in each case there are reasons for believing that the reference is to a demon. That in the verse before us the thought of a demon was present is certain if, as seems not improbable, the *Septuagint* reflects a more original Hebrew than the present text: ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ; Aquila, too, reads: ἀπὸ δηγμοῦ δεμ[ονίζου-τος μεσημβρίας].³ In Rabbinical literature the verse was understood in this sense,⁴ and *Keteb* is used there as the proper name of a demon (see below). It is for these reasons that the translation given above seems justified. That there should have been a belief in some special mid-day demon is highly probable; in later Judaism it was believed that demons were specially active then,⁵ and in some Babylonian

¹ OW. 16.

² See EXPOSITOR (April, 1907), p. 327, and cf. the many instances in the Gospels, cf. Hastings, *DCG*. i. 441.

³ See the fragment of Aquila's version, transcribed from a Cairo Palimpsest, in Taylor's edition of *Pirqe Aboth* . . . (Cambridge, 1897).

⁴ E.g. *Pesachim*, 111b.

⁵ FW. 254.

texts there are some suggestive passages.¹ The *Midrash* is so instructive on this verse that a short extract may be given ; in reference to *Keteb* we read : “ Our Rabbis said, ‘ It is a demon (רשע) ’ ” ; the words that follow are unfortunately, according to Wünsche, untranslatable, owing to the corrupt state of the text ; but it continues : “ Rabbi Huna, speaking in the name of Rabbi Jose, said : ‘ The poisonous *Keteb* was covered with scales and with hair, and sees only out of one eye, the other one is in the middle of his heart ; and he is powerful, not in the darkness nor in the sun, but between darkness and the sun(-shine). He rolls himself up like a ball, and stalks about from the fourth to the ninth hour, from the 17th of Tammuz to the 9th of Ab ; and everyone who sees him falls down on his face. Chiskia saw him and fell upon his face.’ Rabbi Pinchas bar Chama, the priest, said : ‘ Once a man saw him, and he was thrown down upon his face.’ Rabbi Samuel bar Rab Jizshak commanded the schoolmasters to let the children be free during those four hours. Rabbi Jochanan commanded the schoolmasters not to whip the children from the 17th of Tammuz to the 9th of Ab. That is what the words, ‘ Because of *Keteb* who destroys at mid-day,’ mean.”²

Verse 7.

יִפֹּל מֵעֶדְדֵךָ אֶלֶף וְיִרְבֶּבָה מִיְמִינֶךָ אֵלֶיךָ לֹא יָבֹשׁ :

A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand, unto thee it shall not come nigh.

There is no difficulty about either the Hebrew or Greek text here, they are in perfect order ; the difficulty of the passage lies in the correct interpretation of it ; what do the words refer to ? It is, of course, possible to explain

¹ Jastrow, 332, 342-345.

² Wünsche, *Op. cit.* ii. 69.

the "thousands" as referring to those who do not trust in Jahwe, these men will in consequence become victims of the pestilence spoken of in the preceding verse. This, however, seems to be pushing poetical licence a little too far, especially (as has already been pointed out) in view of the fact that there is little or nothing in the psalm to show that wicked men are referred to (see above, on verse 3). In accordance with the general belief in the existence of great numbers of demons, it seems permissible to hold that the "thousands" in this verse refer to these. The Arabs certainly believed that there were immense numbers of them ;¹ this belief was shared by the Babylonians ;² in a Babylonian text, moreover, reference is made to the demons who walk at the side of a man,³ thus forcibly recalling the verse before us. The teaching of later Judaism agrees with this ; in *Berachoth*, 51a, it is said that the demons gather themselves together in companies ; the whole world is full of *Mazzikin*, according to *Tanchuma Mishpatim*, 19 ;⁴ the number is given by one Rabbi as seven and a half millions ; elsewhere it is stated that every man has ten thousand at his right hand and a thousand at his left,—a clear indication, as it would seem, of the Rabbinical interpretation of our psalm. Moreover, in the *Midrash* this verse is commented on as follows : "The left hand . . . a thousand angels protect, in order to guard it against evil spirits ; the right hand . . . ten thousand angels protect, in order to guard it against evil spirits. Rabbi Chanina bar Abahu said : ' . . . If a thousand evil spirits assemble at the left hand they fall . . . and if ten thousand assemble at the right hand they fall ' . . ." ⁵ The meaning of this

¹ Wellh. 148, 149.

² See further, EXPOSITOR (April, 1907), p. 325.

³ Jastrow, 355, 357.

⁴ FW. 254.

⁵ Wünsche, *Op. cit.* ii. 69.

verse may therefore with some justification be said to be that although a man be surrounded by these thousands of invisible enemies, no harm will come to him if he sets his trust in Jahwe, because Jahwe Himself will protect him by annihilating them.

Verse 8.

As pointed out under verse 3, there are reasons for regarding this verse as a gloss.

Verse 9.

כִּי [אַתָּה יְהוָה מִחֲסִי] עָלְיוֹן שִׁמְתָּ מְעוֹנָךְ :

For [Thou Jahwe art my refuge] the Most High hast thou chosen as thy protector.

The text here is obviously out of order ;¹ the words which have been placed in square brackets are most likely a gloss. But the meaning of the verse is clear ; the thousands of demons which assail a man cannot do him any injury if he looks to Jahwe as his protector. It will be seen that if verse 8 and the words enclosed in brackets be deleted, the sequence of thought, as well as the actual text, runs much more smoothly.

Verse 10.

לֹא־תֵאָנֶה אֵלֶיךָ רָעָה וְנִגַע לֹא־יִקְרַב בְּאַהֲלֶיךָ :

No evil shall befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy tent.

The late Professor Curtiss, in his very interesting book *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*, remarks that the "modern Semite who has remained untouched by the world's progress may represent a primitive religion which was in existence before the ancient Babylonian empire began to be, or was even thought of" ;² and later on in his book he

¹ Cf. Briggs *in loc.*, and Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (notes).

² Page 53.

gives, among many other illustrations, the following instances : “ When the people go into the country to cultivate the soil, they often live in caves near the harvest-field. Before taking up their abode in a cave they offer a sacrifice to the spirit of the cave by cutting the animal’s throat at the entrance ” ; a native explains the object of this by saying that “ the people think there are evil spirits in some of the caves.” Again, “ when a newly married couple take up their residence in an old house, or any one makes his home in a new one, it is customary to take a goat or sheep upon the flat roof, and cut its throat so that the blood runs down over the lintel.”¹ In connexion with this one may compare the following Midrashic comment on this verse : “ Rabbi Jochanan said, ‘ Before a dwelling is reared up,² the evil spirits gathered round a man, but after the habitation has been set up, no plague comes nigh thy tent.’ Rabbi Simeon ben Lakish said, ‘ Why do we learn this out of the Psalms, for it says, *The Eternal will bless thee and keep thee* (Num. vi. 24) ? It is because of the evil spirits.”³

Taking these extracts together with the context of this verse, it is difficult to get away from the conviction that the reference is to demons ; and this conviction grows stronger on considering the next verse.

Verse 11.

כִּי מִלְאֲכָוִי יִצְוֶה לְךָ לְשׂוֹמְרֶךָ בְּכָל־דְּרָכֶיךָ :

For His angels He will command for thee, to guard thee in all thy ways.

If we have been correct in holding that there is little or nothing in this psalm to show that the evil from which protection is promised is from the works of evil-disposed

¹ Ibid. 184.

² The reference is, of course, to a tent.

³ Wünsche, *Op. cit.* p. 69.

men,—if, that is to say, this psalm refers throughout to spiritual enemies, then this verse gains greatly in significance. Both in biblical and post-biblical Jewish theology it is taught that evil spirits work antagonistically to God and men, and that these evil spirits are fallen angels (cf. e.g. Isa. xiv. 12 ff.), or the offspring of fallen angels, who are finally subjugated by the powers of heaven; ¹ an echo of this warfare between the angels of God and the powers of darkness is preserved in Jude 9, and possibly a reference to the same thing underlies the strange passage, *vv.* 12–16, in this epistle. “Angels accompany the dead on their departure from this world.” Three bands of angels of the divine ministry accompany the righteous: the first singing, ‘He shall enter in peace’; the second, ‘They shall rest on their couches’; and the third, ‘The one who walketh in uprightness’ (Isa. lvii. 2). But when a wicked man departs, three bands of angels of destruction are described as accompanying him, saying, ‘There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked’ (Isa. lvii. 21).” ²

The thought of the verse before us is strikingly illustrated by the book of Tobit, where we read of Tobias being accompanied during his journeyings by an angel, who teaches him how to drive away an evil spirit; see especially vi. 1–7, 15–17. It is also worth recalling that this verse is quoted in the Gospels in the passage describing our Lord’s temptation by the devil (Matt. iv. 6, Luke iv. 10, 11).

Verse 12.

עַל-כַּפַּיִם יִשְׂאוּנִיךָ פְּוֹתֵתֶנָּה בְּאֶבֶן רִגְלֶךָ :

Upon their palms they shall bear thee lest thou strike thy foot against a stone.

¹ See, e.g., the *Book of Enoch* (ed. Charles) *passim*, but more especially chaps. vi.–xv.

² *Jewish Encycl.* i. 593, where many references are given.

The fact that the word כַּף, the "palm" of the hand, is used instead of the ordinary word for hand (יָד), suggests the idea that the angels hold out their hands for the man to stand upon, and in this way he is raised up wherever an obstacle lies in his path. But the placing of such obstacles would have been believed to be the work of evil spirits; and probably the idea was that they were placed in such a way as to escape notice until the harm was done; otherwise it is difficult to see why angels should be needed to prevent a man from stumbling, even if the words are used symbolically, which, however, the present writer does not believe to be the case.

The remaining verses of this psalm offer further points for consideration, but these could not be dealt with without materially increasing the length of this article.

It may be added, in conclusion, that the interpretation of the psalm which has here been offered does obviously not affect the Christian use of it, excepting in a direction which must be welcome. For the thought that it is *spiritual* enemies which the psalm refers to throughout must still further endear the familiar words, and make the whole psalm more precious than ever to us.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

PANTHEISM.

III.

THE RELATION OF GOD TO THE WORLD.

A SOLUTION of the problem of existence which has appeared so early in the history of human thought, which has persisted through all time down to the present moment, which has assumed so many forms, and which makes itself at home in all kinds of philosophical theories, must have some strange fascination about it, and must have something that commends it to the acceptance of men. What is the fascination of Pantheism, not only for the crude and impulsive, but for the giant intellects among the sons of men? The fascination of Pantheism is to be found, in the first place, in the satisfaction which it seems to give to many and apparently contradictory interests. Unlike Deism it seems to assert a unity of relation between God and the world, which enables the holder to make some kind of distinction between these ideas, and still assert their fundamental unity. It seems to do justice to the ultimate elements into which experience may be analyzed, and to recognize what is called mind, and what is called matter, and still to do justice to the underlying unity in which both may be said to merge. Unlike Deism or Materialism, Pantheism gives scope for the exercise of emotion, allows mystic depth to play on the imagination, encourages the play of religious feeling, and may give rise to the highest kind of emotion. As illustration of this fact we might refer to many sources, and specially to the religious emotion of the great Stoic leaders, and to the religious emotion with which they were endowed when they, as finite spirits, felt themselves to be in fellowship with the Universal Spirit which informed the universe.

The fascination, in the second place, is to be found in the

apparent universality of its recognition of the truth and goodness in all the systems of human thought and in all the aspirations of human life. The recognition of religious interests, and the endeavour to find satisfaction for them, is one source of its strength. In reference to Christianity in particular, we find specially in modern forms of Pantheism an attitude of professed friendliness. We find an apparent friendliness which, if a little patronizing and condescending, yet recognizes that religion is the Sabbath of the lives of the common people. Religion is simply the unreflective side of philosophy, and philosophy must justify and explain it. So a pantheistic or idealistic philosophy does not treat religion as a superstition as Atheism did, nor does it neglect it as popular philosophy did, it does not refuse to religion its mysteries, nor does it identify religion with ethics. On the contrary, it is forward to acknowledge that religion is the best and highest element in human nature, and that Christianity is the best, purest, and highest form of religion, and it strives to transform the truths of Christianity into philosophical principles. It claims to have transformed Christianity into philosophy. Perhaps the shortest way of stating this fact is to quote from Dr. Edward Caird. We quote from him, we might quote from the writings of his brother, the late Principal Caird, we might also quote from others, but space is limited : “ Such Idealism has a close relation to Christianity : it may be said to be but Christianity theorized. It has often been asserted that Hegel’s philosophy of religion is but an artificial accommodation to Christian doctrine of a philosophy which has no inherent relation to Christianity. If, however, we regard the actual development of that philosophy it would be truer to say that it was the study of Christian ideas which produced it. What delivered Hegel from the mysticism in which the later philosophies of Fichte and Schelling tended to lose

themselves, and led him, in his own language, to regard the absolute, 'not merely as substance but as subject,'—which made him recognize with Fichte that the absolute is spiritual, and yet enabled him with Schelling to see in nature, as the opposite of spirit, the very means of its realization,—was his thorough appropriation of the ethical and religious necessity of Christianity. In the great Christian aphorism that, 'he who loses his life alone can save it,' he found a key to the difficulties of ethics, a reconciliation of hedonism and asceticism. For what this saying implies is that a spiritual or self-conscious being is one who is in contradiction with himself when he makes his individual self the end. In opposing his own interest to that of others, he is preventing their interest from becoming his; all things are his and his only who has died to himself. But if this is the truth of morality it is something more, for 'morality is the nature of things.' We cannot separate the law of the life of man from the law of the world wherein he lives. And if it is the nature of things, as it is the nature of spirit, that he who loses his life shall save it, then the world must be referred to a spiritual principle, and the Christian doctrine of the nature of God is only the converse of the Christian law of ethics." (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, ninth edition, vol. xvi. p. 102.)

"To regard the Absolute not merely as substance but as subject" was, according to Dr. Caird, the great achievement of Hegel. Nor is this the only place in which Dr. Caird sets forth the ultimate unity which is both the starting-point and the goal of his system. He is speaking of the transition from Plato to Aristotle, and in the course of his exposition the following passage occurs. "If a philosopher be able to regard all nature as the realization of an immanent design, which becomes more and more completely manifested the higher we rise in the scale of being; if, further, he is able to view the imperfect life of the lower orders of creatures as

subordinated to the fuller existence of those which stand higher in that scale, it is natural to expect that in the last resort he will be able to regard all being as the manifestation or realization of the perfectly self-determined life of God." (*The Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers*, vol. i. pp. 277-8.) One other passage may be quoted. "The consciousness of self and the consciousness of the not-self cannot be made intelligible, unless they are both referred back to that which is deeper and more comprehensive than either, the consciousness of God." (Vol. ii. p. 248.) Again he calls on us to regard "God as a principle of life and intelligence through whom all things are and are known, who is continually realizing Himself in all the infinite difference of the natural and spiritual worlds, and in whom all natural and spiritual beings find their end." (*The Evolution of Religion*, vol. i. p. 112.)

The fascination of Pantheism has never been better set forth than in the fluent pages of Dr. Edward Caird. As we read his works and yield ourselves to his exposition and glide easily down the liquid lapse of his onward movement, we seem to feel that all the interests of faith and philosophy are safe with him. But when we reflect on what is implied in his system we come to the conclusion that, however fluent and however graceful the exposition, and however he may in terms seem to save all the interests of religion, and of Christianity in particular, the God he leaves to us is after all only the final synthesis of subject and object. He is not a realized God. He is only the God who is continually realizing Himself in all the infinite difference of the natural and spiritual worlds, and all things and all being is only "the manifestation of the perfectly self-determined life of God." He states his thesis beautifully, he seems to recognize so fully the beauty and utility of religion, he is so gracious to Christianity, that we almost forget the consequences of his

theory, and we forget that on his view the world is as indispensable to God as God is to the world. We never find in Dr. Edward Caird's writings the brusqueness of Bradley, or the defiance which is thrust forth in other idealistic writers, but the underlying Pantheism is there all the same.

Whatever may be our estimate of the idealistic philosophy, and whatever criticism we may pass upon it, it may be well to state here that for a theistic faith it is absolutely necessary to insist on the distinction between God and the world, and while the world is dependent on God, God is not dependent on the world. The Christian conception of God insists that in Him there is no becoming, in Him there is no realization of Himself. In Him there is no darkness at all. God is perfect, He is the blessed God, in Whom all ideals are realized, a real, concrete, self-determined being, of Whom, and through Whom, and to Whom are all things. Now all idealistic, all pantheistic theories assume that God is in the process of realization, and that the evolution of the world is the evolution of God. Dr. Caird repeats this on every possible occasion, and never misses the opportunity of setting it forth. He exhausts the resources of poetry, and uses all the possible ways of describing the ultimate unity of things, until we are fascinated with the inexhaustible variety of his exposition, and yet we find that at the basis of it there is only the old vulgar pantheistic idea of unity, the unity which is at once the road and those who walk on it.

This is not the place to set forth the Christian conception of God. Nor can we dwell on the theistic conception of God, nor deal at any length with His relation to the world and to man. Not one, but many treatises would be required for that stupendous task. But it may be briefly said that it is not possible to set forth the idea of God in mere abstract terms. For God is concrete, determinate being, in Whom is

all fullness, in Whom there is no process of realization, in Whom there is realized Perfection of life and purpose. He is, and from Him all things have proceeded, but in such a way that they add nothing to His perfection. The world is a fulfilment of His purpose, the expression of His will, not a realization of His being. His is a self-determined life, and the form, the method, and the measure of the working of all other being are determined by Him. Hence from the theistic point of view, and especially from the point of view of Christian Theism, it is neither proper, nor adequate, to speak of God either as substance or as subject. If we speak of Him as substance, we are immediately landed in a discussion as to the nature of substance, as to its modes of manifestation, and as to the degrees in which it is realized in any particular being. In the long run it is impossible for us to avoid identifying God with the universal substance, and impossible to refuse to identify all being as one, without ultimate difference. Nor is it possible to think of God as mere "subject." For this immediately commands us to search for an object as universal as the subject we have postulated. What Dr. Martineau demanded "as an objective datum" comes back and imperiously demands recognition. This is the weakness of all systems of idealism. It is the fatal anthropomorphic element in all of them. They, in the final issue, simply magnify the one self with which they are empirically acquainted, and as that self demands a not-self, and that subject demands an object, so the absolute self-consciousness is made into the likeness of the individual self. Idealism is so far true, as it is a real account of the evolution of the finite self, as it depicts that self in the process of appropriating the riches of the world, making himself at home in it, and realizing himself in reaction against it, and becoming master of himself and of the world as the outcome of the process. But from that point of view all other selves

are simply means for the realization of the self, which is the subject of description. They are raw material to be worked up into the process of self-realization. But this is a universe of many selves, and the final unity must be of a kind which will recognize many selves in mutual relation, and idealism—if it be true—must provide for that necessity.

Again, to describe God as subject, not only demands an object, but it lays stress only on one aspect of reality, as reality is embodied in the individual self. It asserts the only relation between God and the world, as a relation between subject and object. It is the relation between a thinker and his thought, between a knower and what is known. There is, no doubt, a true relation between a thinker and his thought, between a knower and what is known. But a self is not a mere subject, nor is it a mere knower. A self is in a real world, a world which is not only perceived and known; it is a world of activity, and the self is also an active self. He has to recognize the ongoing of the world, and to find what is the particular "go" of everything in it. That is to say, the self has to recognize what are the ideas and the ideals which are in the world, and to act accordingly. It has also to recognize that it is a plastic world, a world ready to accept and to carry out his ideals if he knows how to make the world accept these. From one point of view the self recognizes the system of nature, and the thought which is there; from another point of view nature is the place and sphere in which he works out his own ideals, impresses them on nature, and adds to the thought which is there. In the one point of view he is a learner, he is receptive, he is conforming his thoughts to a standard; in the other he is a creator, an originator, one who can conceive ends, and take means for their realization.

Now it would appear that the idealistic philosophy, specially in the intellectualistic form of it which recognizes God

simply as subject, neglects altogether the active, causative side of the divine activity. It is constantly so occupied with the world as the content of the divine thought, as the object for the infinite subject, that it has no view of the possibility of a divine activity which contemplates ends and seeks to realize them. Consequently the activity of will is thrust into the background, and there is a constant tendency to minimize or to deny causation as a real linkage in the connectedness of things. Will is only the self-realization of an idea, and causation is only a subsidiary principle necessary only for the description, and not necessary for the appreciation of things in their wholeness. The reaction against the one-sided intellectualism of idealism has brought about a change, which has come to such growth in the writings of James, Schiller, and Dewey, the significance of which may be seen in James' latest work styled *Pragmatism*. Into that issue we do not enter at present.

What is insisted on here is that a philosophy which neglects Will, which minimizes causation, which eliminates the notion of activity, has neglected a fundamental factor of human experience and must retrace its steps, and seek a wider, truer synthesis. For Will is a real factor of experience, and must be recognized. Theism cannot dispense with it. We still have faith in the old saying, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." According to this statement there was a time when the heavens and the earth were not, and there came a time when they became. But the divine life was, and never began to be. In Christian Theism the life of God was not a life of mere substance, nor a life as mere subject, nor a life as absolute, nor a life which can be adequately described by abstract predicates. It is the life of the Living God, not an abstract life, but a life of absolute fullness in which there is oneness and difference, in which there is the absolute realization of all perfection, whether

that perfection is regarded from the metaphysical, or the ethical, or the religious point of view. Without entering into detail we quote the deepest words which have ever been written about God. God is Spirit, God is light, God is love, and in these three sayings there is more and truer philosophy than there is in all the speculations of all the idealistic schemers known to history.

It may be well here to quote from Professor Royce. "There is no escape from the infinite Self except by self-contradiction. Ignorant as I am about first causes, I am at least clear about the Self. If you deny him, you already in denying affirm him. You reckon ill when you leave him out. Him when you fly, he is the wings. He is the doubter and the doubt. You in vain flee from his presence. The wings of the morning will not aid you. Nor do I mean all this as a sort of mysticism. The truth is, I assure you, simply a product of dry logic. When I try to tell you about it in detail, I shall weary you by my wholly unmystical analysis of common-places. You cannot stir, nay, you cannot even stand still in thought without it. Nor is it an unfamiliar idea. On the contrary, philosophy finds trouble in bringing it to your consciousness merely *because* it is so familiar. When they told us in childhood that we could not see God just *because* He was everywhere, just because His omnipresence gave us no chance to discern Him and to fix our eyes upon Him, they told us a deep truth in allegorical fashion. The infinite Self, as we shall learn, is actually asserted by you in every proposition you utter,—is there at the heart, so to speak, of the very multiplication table. The Self is so little a thing, merely guessed at as the unknowable source of experience, that already, in the very least of experiences, you unconsciously know him as something present. This, as we shall find, is the deepest tragedy of our finitude, that continually he comes to his own, and his own receive him not, that he becomes

flesh in every least incident of our lives ; whilst we, gazing with wonder upon His world, search here and there for first causes, look for miracles, and beg him to show us the Father, since that alone will suffice us. No wonder that we remain agnostics. ‘ Hast thou been so long time with me, and yet hast thou not *known me* ? ’ Such is the answer of the Logos to every doubting question. Seek Him not as an outer hypothesis to explain experience. Seek Him not anywhere in the clouds. He is no ‘ thing-in-itself.’ But, for all that, experience contains him. He is the reality, the soul of it. ‘ Did not our heart burn within us while he talked with us by the way ? ’ And, as we shall see, He does not talk merely to our hearts. He reveals Himself to our closest scrutiny.’ (*The Spirit of Modern Philosophy*, by Josiah Royce, pp. 349–350.)

It is a curious passage, partly because of the use and the application of the language of Scripture and devotion, partly because of the emotion expressed in the passage, and partly because he passes from the infinite self to the Logos, and from the Logos to the living absolute as if these were one and the same. Still more curious is the fact that he uses the language descriptive only of a relation between persons, and applicable only when there is a sense of personal relationship, in order to set forth a relationship into which personality does not enter. Take away the personal reference in the words referred to by Professor Royce, and so far quoted as from the Gospels, and they become meaningless. There are certain emotions which arise only in relations between persons ; and even when something like them arises in human hearts in other references, these arise only when the object is personified, and attains to a certain kind of personality.

One has to raise the question forced on us by the assumptions of pantheistic idealism, can a conscious self be part of an all-inclusive self ? It is assumed on all hands that it is

both possible and conceivable. In fact the idealists assume it, while one seeks in vain for a discussion of it. Professor Pringle-Pattison asked the question, and denied the possibility of the assumption, and his question was ignored. At least any adequate discussion of it is unknown to the present writer. It may be well to quote from him. "Though selfhood, as was seen in the earlier lectures, involves a duality in unity, and is describable as subject object, it is none the less true that each Self is a unique existence, which is perfectly *impervious*, if I may so speak, to other selves—*impervious* in a fashion of which the impenetrability of matter is a faint analogue. The self, accordingly, resists invasion; in its character of self it refuses to admit another self within itself, and thus be made, as it were, a mere retainer of something else. The unity of things (which is not denied) cannot be properly expressed by making it depend upon a unity of a Self in all thinkers; for the very characteristic of a self is this exclusiveness. So far from being a principle of union in the sense desired, the self is in truth the very apex of separation and differentiation. It is none the less true, of course, that only through selfhood am I able to recognize the unity of the world and my own union with the source of all, and this is the incentive to the metaphysical use of the idea of a universal Self which I am criticizing. But though the self is thus, in knowledge, a principle of unification, it is, in existence, or metaphysically, a principle of isolation. And the unification which proceeds in the one case is, to the end, without prejudice to the exclusive self-assertion in the other. There is no deliverance or consciousness which is more unequivocal than that which testifies to this independence and exclusiveness. I have a centre of my own, a will of my own, which no one shares with me or can share—a centre which I maintain even in my dealings with God Himself. For it is eminently false to say that I put off, or can

put off, my personality here. The religious consciousness lends no countenance whatever to the representation of the human soul as a mere mode or efflux of the divine ; on the contrary, only in a person, in a relatively dependent or self-centred being, is religious approach to God possible. Religion is the self-surrender of the human will to the divine. 'Our wills are ours to make them thine.' But this is *self-surrender*, a surrender which only self, only will can make." (*Hegelianism and Personality*, pp. 227-9.)

The quotation denies in terms the possibility of the assumption made by almost all the modern absolute idealists. And it seems that Professor Pringle-Pattison is right. The absolute, the universal self, the single life, the one experience, to use the various descriptions of the one assumption, alone truly is, and all other beings are subsumed as predicates of it. But how can a consciousness be treated as an attribute of another consciousness ? Every self combines and relates together a succession of experiences, each of which is unique, and these in their uniqueness and in their totality are for the individual self alone. The self has its own experience, and that experience is its own. The real being of a self is that it exists for itself, not for another mind which may know it. Now philosophy must take cognizance of this uniqueness of every self, and recognize that the living, concrete, present, conscious experience of a self is unique. True, there may be an experience common to many selves, but that arises when we neglect the individual experience in its concreteness and lay stress on the abstract universal attributes, taken in abstraction from the particular selves whose experience they are. No self is a part or an attribute of any other self. An absolute, inclusive self-consciousness is unintelligible.

There must be room in the world for a system of self-conscious beings, for they are there. Our philosophy must

not explain facts away, it must recognize them. But a pantheistic scheme does not recognize the uniqueness of the self. If we are to recognize the uniqueness of a self, much more must we recognize the uniqueness of the self-conscious Spirit from Whom all things are. If we do, then to describe God as the Absolute, as Substance, as Subject, is to use inadequate language. If God be self-conscious spirit, then He is not the Absolute. Is there no other form of unity than the unity of one block? is there no other solution save one which identifies God with the sum of being? Is there not a unity of a system which shall include God and all other consciousnesses, and relate them all to one another in some way which will conserve the meaning, worth and reality of each self, and yet make them so related as to form a spiritual system?

A full answer to this great question cannot be given here, but any adequate answer must make provision for selves in all their uniqueness. The unity of the absolute, of substance, of subject, or of any one abstract category will not suffice. It must be a unity which will make room for self-centred beings in mutual relation, which will respect the uniqueness of each self, and yet make provision for their subsistence in one system. But this Pantheism in any of its forms cannot do. Metaphysically, epistemologically, psychologically, from whatever point of view one regards Pantheism, we find it burdened with inadequate regard to truth and fact. But the gravest defect of Pantheism appears when we view it from the ethical side. We must grant to them this, that they have the courage of their convictions. They boldly minimize evil. "The very presence of ill in the temporal order is the condition of the Perfection of the eternal order." (Royce, *The World and the Individual*, ii. p. 385.) "The absolute is the richer for every disself. And for all the diversity which it embraces." (F. H.

Bradley, *Appearance and Reality*, p. 204.) Other references might be given, and while philosophers are thus explaining away the fact of evil and of pain, men are groaning under the misery of their lot, and are painfully conscious of the fact of sin and evil. The main objection is that this conception runs counter to all the ethical convictions of man. It jumbles together the moral, the non-moral, the physical and the spiritual worlds. All tumbles together into an indiscriminate mass, in which all moral differences disappear, and one thing works as well as another to enrich the harmony of the Absolute. Frederic Harrison is right when he says that "No force can amalgamate in one idea tornadoes, earthquakes, interstellar spaces, pestilences, brotherly love, unselfish energy, patience, hope, trust and greed." (*Pantheism and Cosmic Emotion*, p. 4.) But on the view of Pantheism these moral values vanish, and evil has its place in the Absolute. There can, on these terms, be no abiding distinction between good and evil, virtue and vice, right and wrong. These have their home in the Absolute; and however wide the discords may seem to the moral consciousness, they ultimately serve only to enrich the Absolute, and however great may be the ill of the temporal order, yet that ill is only the condition of the perfection of the eternal order. Yet these moral values abide, and the good, the beautiful and the true do belong to the temporal order. Any philosophy which obliterates moral values, and which apologizes for ugliness, evil and sin, and makes these to be essential to the perfection of the eternal order, is under the necessity of revising its procedure, and of bringing its conclusions into something like harmony with the moral convictions and aspirations of mankind.

We quote here from Professor Howieson. "If the Infinite Self *includes* us all, and all our experiences,—sensations and sins, as well as the rest,—in the unity of one life, and includes

us and them *directly* ; if there is but one and the same final Self for each and all, then, with a literalness indeed appalling, He is we, and we are He ; He is *I*, and *I* am He. And I think it will appear later, from the nature of the argument by which the Absolute Reality as Absolute Experience is reached, that the exact and direct way of stating the case is baldly, *I am He*. Now, if we read the conception in the first way, what becomes of our ethical independence ?—what of our *personal* reality, our righteous, i.e. reasonable responsibility—responsibility to which we *ought* to be held ? Is not He the sole real *agent* ? Are we anything but the steadfast and changeless modes of His eternal thinking and perceiving ? Or, if we read the conception in the second way, what becomes of *Him* ? Then, surely, He is but another name for *me* ; or for any one of *you*, if you will. And how can there be talk of a Moral Order, since there is but a single mind in the case ?—we cannot legitimately call that mind a person. . . . Judging by *experience* alone,—the only point of view allotted by Professor Royce to the particular self,—judging merely by that, even then the experience is not direct and naïve, but comparatively organized, there is no *manifold* of selves ; the finite self and the Infinite Self are but two names at the opposite poles of one lonely reality, which from its isolation is without possible moral significance.” (*The Conception of God*, pp. 98–9.)

In order to bring out the underlying quantitative nature of all the pantheistic views we have been considering, we quote from Strauss, who, perhaps more than any other, has the merit of bringing into the light the ultimate nature of Pantheism. “If reality is ascribed to the idea of the unity of the divine and human natures, is this equivalent to the admission that this unity must actually have been manifested, as it never has been, and never will be, in one individual ? This is indeed not the mode in which Idea realizes

itself ; it is not wont to lavish all its fullness on one exemplar and be niggardly towards all others—to express itself perfectly in that one individual, and imperfectly in all the rest : it rather loves to distribute its riches among a multiplicity of exemplars which reciprocally complete each other—in the alternate appearance and suppression of a series of individuals.” (*Life of Jesus*, English Translation, pp. 779–80.) The quantitative character of this proposition will be noticed. It is worth looking at. The assumption is that for the Idea to lavish all its fullness on one individual is to be niggardly to the rest. Is this so ? Is it not the fact that the way to enrich all individuals is to lavish fullness on one individual in order that all others might have a pattern to follow, a type to emulate ? Does it make me any poorer to think of the mathematical genius of a Newton, of the poetry of Homer, Dante and Shakespeare ?—of the systematic thinkers of the world, like Plato, Aristotle, Kant and Hegel ? Strauss has transported the material idea of wealth into the sphere of wealth of another kind. In the spiritual world wealth is kept by giving it away, and the more we give away the more we have. In this spiritual world persons count. A great personality enriches the whole race, and the greater he is the more he enriches them. Intellectual wealth, moral wealth, spiritual wealth can be given away and kept; great and true thought rightly expressed enriches the whole world. “A thing of beauty is a joy for ever”; a scientific conquest of nature, a thought which harnesses the forces of nature for the use of man, is an abiding possession of man. A true thought is not the exclusive possession of any one mind, it may become a common possession. Suppose that the idea should have realized itself in one exemplar, suppose one in whom the ideal of humanity was perfectly realized, would not that exemplar be the glory of every individual who could see and understand it ? A perfectly realized self would

enrich every self in the world. Along this line of thought one can trace the outline of a kingdom of God, in which can be seen the Father of all, and the spirits of just men made perfect; and on the one hand the Father gives fully to these spirits the wealth of His own thought, life and grace, but what He gives is not quantitative, and the giving does not make His less, for the language of quantity has no meaning in this sphere. On the other hand the spirits of just men made perfect receive out of the fullness of God grace for grace, and the more they are able to receive the more do they become themselves. Yet God is God, and man is man, and there need be no confusion between the two, nor any merging of one into the other, if we realize the nature of spiritual giving and receiving. The unity thus reached does not merge a self into a mere quantitative obliteration of differences. It recognizes differences. It maintains self-identity throughout, but in such a way that there may be perfect communion and spiritual union in the kingdom of God. It only needs that we recognize persons, and the worth of persons, and their continued oneness of being, and also recognize the fact of their oneness in spiritual communion, to justify for ourselves the possibility of such a kingdom of God. But such a unity is not yet, it is the goal not the starting point of the activity of God. History describes for us the making of such a world, and Scripture enables us to see the process of the work. It is not an easy task to make such a world, nor is it easy to make rational beings in such a way as to make them make themselves. To describe the process is another task, but pantheistic thought has misstated the problem, and has so confused the issues as to make a solution impossible.

JAMES IVERACH.

*THE PHILOSOPHICAL METHOD OF THE NEW
THEOLOGY.*

IV

MONISM, whatever adjective may be put before it, is the final outcome of the intellectualist method. Intellectualism is nothing if not architectonic. It is impatient with any appearance of incompleteness. The thought that the mind is not able to grip everything presented to it irritates the intellectualist cruelly. Unless he can pigeon-hole every element in the universe he is miserable. He would also be utterly ashamed to confess that he could not contrive a symbol or name that would cover everything that exists. He searches, therefore, for a term or category into which all reality can be crammed. This search is difficult, for things are so obviously different. How can dynamite, a burning cigar and a millionaire all be put together in the same space without being disintegrated? How can aspirations, pork pies, the law of averages, Robert Browning and the inhabitants of Mars all be classed under one title? But they must be. The category must be sought, and, naturally enough to one knowing the function of numbers, the intellectualist finds his desired category in number, and triumphantly asserts that all reality is *one*. That is, it is possible to think of all things at the same time if you discharge their differences and only retain their existence or reality.¹ The bare fact of existence is the one thing that all elements of reality have in common. But having this in common they are one. A moment's reflection shows us what

¹ It must not be forgotten that you have no longer got *them*, any more than you would have the dynamite, millionaire and cigar in case suggested above. You have the bare existence of *something*: in the illustration, gases and a smell of burnt flesh.

this means. It means that the category of unity is used to express infinity; which is indeed a solemn metaphysical Irish bull. But if we give it a Greek name and call it Monism the fact that it is a bull is generally regarded as immaterial.

Mr. Campbell, being an intellectualist, and a man of intrepid desire for consistency, is of course a Monist. It should be said, however, that he is very much interested in the adjective attached to his Monism. It is "idealistic Monism." Other Monists have preferred other adjectives. Some choose "materialistic," and others "spiritual." But surely the adjective matters not one whit, except in that it indicates a desire to "hedge" on Monism. For to assert that the "oneness" is, e.g., idealistic, is little better than to surrender to Dualism, since it suggests that there is something in the infinite congeries of finite elements that will *not* let itself be crammed into the monistic pigeon-hole—in this case, matter. Confession of surrender is avoided by calling the thing ruled out "illusion"—but by this time the Monism itself has become illusory. No, to be consistent one must be an unqualified Monist, or an agnostic Monist, and say, "What reality is I don't know, but it's all one."

We need not therefore pause over the adjective, but may pass on to look further at Mr. Campbell's Monism.

The first thing one notices is that Mr. Campbell is chary of giving it any positive explanation. He admits that his doctrine is derived from Hegel, but pleads that the limits of his subject do not allow him to do more than assert that there is but one substance, and that is "consciousness." Of course this is natural enough. You cannot describe a mere misapplied category of unity with any satisfaction, especially where the task of trying to put a content into the category (as when Monism is called "idealistic") is bound to force something out of it that ought to remain

in. So the Monist finds it much more effective to denounce Dualism—obviously (it is thought) the alternative to Monism. Mr. Campbell has quite a horror of Dualism. If an argument can be described as amounting “to a practical Dualism” he seems to think it irretrievably ruined. He regards the getting rid of Dualism as the highest moral duty of the theologian: “We have to get rid of Dualism.” And it is at this point that we see how implacable Mr. Campbell’s intellectualism is. The issue between Monism and Dualism seems to him more vital than that between good and evil. Evil is a shadow—Dualism is almost a disease that we “have to get rid of” at all cost, even at the cost of minimizing sin.

Now I am not here arguing in favour of Dualism. Dualism suffers from almost all the ills that afflict Monism. It too, like its hereditary foe (for the Cain of Monism has been slaying the Abel of Dualism from generation to generation), is the offspring of intellectualism out of the category of number. But dualism does at least recognize the existence of differences, and it is respectable because it generally becomes a metaphysic under the stress of ethical sensibility (as in the case of Martineau). Now it is impossible to ignore the fact that Mr. Campbell has the most vivid ethical sensibility. Consequently, beneath his stark intellectualism, with its cry for Monism and its repudiation of Dualism, the reader is continually coming in contact with a moral Dualism in *The New Theology* which laughs all metaphysical theories to scorn. One or two quotations will illustrate this. Speaking of the doctrine of the Fall, Mr. Campbell says that the purpose of the fall into sin is good, “and there is nothing to mourn over except our own slowness at getting into line with the cosmic purpose.” That “exception” begs the whole question: there is an obvious difference in kind between the “cosmic” purpose and

our slowness, even if that slowness is only temporary. Again, "we, too, are one with God in so far as our lives express the same thing" (i.e. divine love). Here we have an explicit Dualism. Insert the word "only" after "God" and it becomes clearer, but it is there just as the sentence stands. Beyond certain limits we are *not* one with God. We are other than God, and different from Him. More definite still are these sentences: "There are two tendencies discernible throughout nature and in human history. These two tendencies are essentially opposed, are ever in conflict, and ever will be until the whole world is subdued to Christ, and God is all in all." "All acts of selfish gratification of which men are capable are the turning of the current of divine energy the wrong way." Here we have a wrong and a right that are radically opposed, antagonistic elements that are expressed in different terms in the phrase: "To cease to be a sinner is perforce to be a saviour."

Enough has been said to show that Mr. Campbell's intellectualism, resulting in Monism, comes into unavoidable collision with his moral sensibility, which is bound to recognize Dualism. Indeed, at one point this Dualism definitely breaks through his intellectualism and forces him to assert the freedom of the will. He does this, however, with obvious reluctance. "I will frankly confess," he says, "that in strict logic I can find no place for the freedom of the will." He is also careful to reduce the scope of the will's freedom as much as possible. But it must be insisted that this admission of freedom inevitably destroys the whole monistic edifice, and justifies, or rather entrenches, Mr. Campbell's moral sensibility against his intellectualism.

This, however, Mr. Campbell has not observed or admitted. Perhaps he has never thought the metaphysical problem out, for, despite his protestations, one cannot read his book

without feeling that his real interest is theological and not philosophical. Anyway, he passes rapidly away from the metaphysical argument, bearing with him as a sort of booty his doctrine of Monism. This he brings into the theological "universe of thought" (to use the slang of logic) and with it sets about the reconstruction of doctrine. We must therefore follow him as he takes the momentous step from philosophy to theology.

V.

The first consequence of Mr. Campbell's Monism in theological discussion is his refusal to attend to any diversity in the realm of truth. "All truth," he says, "is really one and the same." So he need not stop to investigate the characteristic differences between religious belief, and philosophic and scientific statements. This epistemological Monism has momentous results. But the fallacies induced by the assumption that there is ultimately only one order of truth are by no means confined to the New Theology. They mark nearly all current theologies, and until they are got rid of a valid modern theology is not possible. All we can say upon this point is that had it not been taken for granted, despite the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, that "all truth is one and the same," Mr. Campbell would have written a very different book. In fairness, however, it should be said that his critics have been in general as much at sea as himself in respect of the theory of truth.

But we must pass to the next consequence, which is really linked with this first. It is very obvious. It is the identification of God with the unity into which Mr. Campbell has compressed infinity at the bidding of his intellectualism. The passage from metaphysics to theology

is really the exchange of the term "God" for the empty *schema* of "oneness." It is the effort to interpret Monism in terms compatible with Monotheism. Mr. Campbell sets about the task bravely. He wrestles at it with admirable determination, and his very phrases reek with the sweat of the struggle. If will power could have made him succeed he would have succeeded. But the task upon which he had entered was an impossible one and his failure—we need not hesitate to say so—has been complete.

If Mr. Campbell had been consistent in making the change from philosophy to theology he could only have turned his Monism into a Pantheism. Of that there can be no doubt. Strictly speaking, Monism and Pantheism are correlatives. But Mr. Campbell sees clearly enough that Pantheism will not do. And here his trouble begins. He writes his book with the fear of Pantheism continually before his eyes, and his determination to avoid Pantheism necessitates one or two evolutions which we must now observe.

First of all there is an act of homage to the transcendence of God. This is made conspicuously enough in the definition "God is all; He is the universe, and infinitely more," and in the statement that it is an obvious truth that "the infinite being of God must transcend the infinite universe." To vary our figure, we may liken these two phrases to an earthwork hastily thrown up for the defence of Mr. Campbell's position. He hides¹ behind this earthwork when attacked for departure from Theism, and it gives him shelter from which to bombard the theistic position with nearly every other phrase about God in his book.

¹ It has been almost amusing to watch the play made with these two phrases by Mr. Campbell's supporters in the Press. That Pantheism is the proper name for Mr. Campbell's position has been obvious to many of his critics. But how baffling to have these sentences quoted against them!

For Mr. Campbell, having once paid homage to transcendence, is careful not to let it have any actual influence in his thinking. We get two modes of God, he says, "the infinite, perfect, unconditioned, primordial being; and the finite, imperfect, conditioned and limited being of which we are ourselves expressions." The first of these modes is transcendent, and so we can never know anything about it; "it is only as we read Him in the universe that we can know anything about Him." This transcendent mode of God is therefore dismissed from further consideration, and when Mr. Campbell speaks of God he of course means merely the God we can read in the universe. Otherwise he would be talking entirely at random.

And here two remarks must be made. First, this is the point at which it is necessary to repudiate Mr. Campbell's doctrine with the utmost emphasis, so far as it touches theology. To divide God into two parts, so to speak, the lower only of which is knowable to us, and to deny to Him the power of revealing to men His real nature *as transcendent*, is to ruin faith. If in Jesus Christ we have not an adequate revelation of the holy and loving purpose of the transcendent God, we have nothing. To treat Jesus as an element in the knowable "universe" which might have to be repudiated were we ever admitted to a vision of the transcendent Deity, is to rob Him of any right to our worship, whatever be our other theories. Next, it is obvious that this radical distinction between God as "the universe" and God as the "infinitely more," defeats Mr. Campbell's Monism. For if we must be wholly ignorant of the transcendent God, how can we be sure that He is identical with the immanent?

Having noted Mr. Campbell's homage to the transcendence of God and subsequent practical desertion of that theory, let us see how he describes God immanent in the universe.

He uses many phrases in this work. God (it is not worth while to repeat the word "immanent," for the God who is the universe is the only God Mr. Campbell pretends to know anything about, and the only God he describes) is the "higher-than-self whose presence is so unescapable." He is "the uncaused Cause of all existence." He is every one's own existence. He is "the mysterious Power which is finding expression in the universe." "The real God is the God expressed in the universe and in yourself." That is to say, if any man wishes to know God thoroughly he must make an induction of all that is in the universe and say, "God is all this." He must leave nothing out. Inasmuch as he omits even the smallest element he is leaving out a part of God. Now the consequences of such an induction are obvious. They necessitate the inclusion in our notion of God of all that is ugly as well as of all that is beautiful; of all that is wicked as well as of all that is good. There is no escape. Everything must go into your pigeon hole of unity if you are a Monist, and everything must put its essence into your idea of God if you are a believer in Mr. Campbell's New Theology. The lower-than-self must be God as well as the higher-than-self.

Here it is that we face the gravest consequences of Mr. Campbell's application of his Monism to theology. God being, according to *The New Theology*, the All—the universe including each man's self—He must *be* sin. Mr. Campbell never admits this, and still less does he state it clearly. But it is a conclusion inevitably hidden in his premisses and implied in a host of phrases. Take these instances: (1) "The being of God is a complex unity, containing within itself every form of self-consciousness that can possibly exist." Are sin and guilt in any way a form of self-consciousness? Then sin and guilt are contained within the being of God; that is, they are a part of God.

(2) "The imperfection of the infinite creation is not man's fault but God's will, and is a means towards a great end." But part of that imperfection is sin, and therefore sin itself is "not man's fault but God's will." And God's *will* is the very heart of His heart, the essence of His personality.

(3) In another passage Mr. Campbell calls God "the Power revealed in the cosmos," and goes on to say, "I shall continue to feel compelled to believe that the Power which produced Jesus must at least be equal to Jesus." Under certain conditions this statement would be sound enough. But not under a monistic premiss. For what is to hinder another from saying: "The Power which produced Nero must at least be equal to Nero"—say in bestiality or cruelty? But these instances are enough to show that Mr. Campbell must find a place for sin in the very nature of God. In order to be true to his monistic principle he must say that the lower-than-self is as truly God as the higher-than-self.

The poet Walt Whitman ("The great poets," says Mr. Campbell, "are the best theologians after all, for they see the farthest") has expressed this view without any reserve in his verses entitled "Chanting the Square Deific." In this poem he attempts to restate the doctrine of God by adding a fourth person to the Godhead, so as to describe completely what Mr. Campbell calls "the real God . . . expressed in the universe and in yourself." The persons of this "Square Deific" are God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit, and—God the Devil. Walt Whitman is a consistent Monist.

Mr. Campbell, however, cannot be a consistent Monist, for his ethical sensibility is in constant revolt against his intellectualism. So he has to find some way out of his dilemma. This he attempts to do by means of his doctrine of sin, to which end we shall now turn.

VI.

“How can there be anything in the universe outside of God?” asks Mr. Campbell. And the answer expected is obviously, “Nohow.” And so—it seems quite simple—sin cannot be in the universe. “Evil is a negative, not a positive term.” “It is not a thing in itself; it is only the perceived privation of what you know to be good, and which you know to be good because of the very presence of limitation, hindrance and imperfection.” “Sin is actually a quest for life, but a quest which is pursued in the wrong way.” It is selfishness. It is isolation from the infinite. It is “slowness at getting into line with the cosmic purpose.” It is a shadow where there should be light.

One aspect of this question I do not propose to labour here. Mr. Campbell has probably had it pointed out clearly enough to him that these phrases are unsatisfactory in the light of our consciousness of sin as something which poisons, stings, burns, destroys our own soul. But what I do want to point out is that this explanation of sin does not get rid of the necessity of including sin as something real in the nature of God as revealed in the Monist's universe. To call the term we apply “negative” is not to make the thing to which it is applied any less real than a thing to which a positive term is applied. Absolute zero is a temperature of *minus* 273° Centigrade. But the term indicates something physically as real as the term *plus* 100° Centigrade. Privation is just as real as abundance, and a wrong direction in any quest is just as real as a right direction. Selfishness is just as real as unselfishness. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Campbell is so taken up with the idea of substance (which in his case is nothing more than the empty category of unity into which he attempts to cram all infinity) that anything which only has to do

with direction or limitation is treated as metaphysically nil. But the distinction between a wrong quest and a right quest is just as vivid metaphysically as is the distinction between time and space. Sin and saintliness may be placed side by side in the same category as each being a "quest," and time and space may be placed side by side in the same category as each being a continuum, but metaphysically the difference between sin and saintliness is even more radical than that between time and space, for they are mutually exclusive and destructive.

At the bottom of Mr. Campbell's failure to see that sin must be treated as real, is that intellectualism which is content to subsume all reality under the notion of number—unity. If all is one and two things are mutually exclusive, then of those two that which we term "positive" is real and the other unreal.

If, however, the reality of sin be once admitted, it must, all dialectics notwithstanding, be given its place in the monistic view of God. Hence when Mr. Campbell says, "Jesus is God, but so are we," and "sin is selfishness, pure and simple," we have a right to conclude that sin is God in us seeking Himself, and is therefore one of the modes of "the self-realization of the infinite"—of God.

This is a conclusion to which Mr. Campbell refuses to advance. But that is not because it is inconsistent with his premisses. It is because it is inconsistent with himself, with his moral sensibility, with his experience of Jesus Christ. And here we see how impossible it is to persist in Mr. Campbell's completely vicious method. That method is determined by Mr. Campbell's intellectualism and not by Jesus Christ. Now and again, as we have seen, Christ does occupy, if but for a moment, His proper place: He is "the undimmed revelation of the highest." Yet the main course of Mr. Campbell's argument is guided, not by

this undimmed revelation, but by the crass intellectualist dogma of Monism. When however that method has led its author to its final logical conclusion, the justification of sin by its inclusion in God, the real worship of Jesus which is in the thinker's heart asserts itself, and the method is deserted, though unconsciously. And this gives us the clue to the problem of method. The Christ who thwarts the method of intellectualism at the last should have determined the method from the first.

Two main things indeed Mr. Campbell has deprived of their proper places in his New Theology. The first is the doctrine of the transcendence of God, and the second is Jesus Christ. May it not be that when these two are allowed to exert their due influence upon theological thinking a more acceptable theology will be evolved? For indeed they are part and parcel of each other, being connected by that very phrase of Mr. Campbell's which calls Jesus "the undimmed revelation of the highest." The highest? What is that but the *transcendent* God? Revelation? What is that but the unveiling to the eyes of men of what by mere searching they could not discover in the universe of which they are a part? If then in Jesus we have this undimmed revelation we must make Him the centre and starting point of our theology—not metaphysical Monism, nor God as immanent, nor anything lower than "the highest." And this is exactly what Mr. Campbell might have done had he carried out the projected "untrammelled return to the Christian sources."

VII.

To sum up: most of us share Mr. Campbell's desire to see Christian theology so reformed as to be in harmony with modern research, and to be able to thrive in the modern intellectual atmosphere. His general aim and ours, in this

matter, are alike. But he is prevented by his false philosophical method from achieving this desired result. Instead of allowing the facts of the Christian sources to give their own message, his intellectualist prejudice forces him to assume a Monism not to be deduced from the Christian sources themselves. This Monism, once adopted, makes a true scientific method impossible, and forces upon Mr. Campbell a doctrine of God which is only saved from the charge of Pantheism by certain assertions not really germane to the general position. This doctrine of God logically makes all evil, including sin, divine. Only, Mr. Campbell's moral sensibility hinders him from admitting this, and forces him instead to deny the real existence of sin. It only remains for me to point out that the foundation of this whole edifice is the doctrine of Monism—a doctrine nowhere taught by Jesus, and having no place in the "Christian sources."

I am sure that Mr. Campbell does not desire that his critics should apologize for speaking frankly of his work. For my part, it is with great reluctance that I have felt it necessary to express such complete divergence from Mr. Campbell's views. But, as already explained, it seems to me necessary for those desiring a really progressive Christian theology to repudiate the method adopted in *The New Theology*. Further, we need not despair of having Mr. Campbell with us in a better advised forward movement. Surely it is not too late for him to take part in a return to Christian sources that shall be untrammelled by Monism. Too late? He is still one of the younger men, and the only obstacle in his way seems to be his adherence to that intellectualist metaphysic which forms the basis of his present teaching. May I venture to commend to his attention and that of his followers two things which should give them some positive modern method

with which to replace the Monism which is both out of date and fallacious? The first is *scientific method*. By this I do not mean the theological speculations of scientists such as are embodied in Sir Oliver Lodge's interesting little venture called "The Substance of Faith," but a logical analysis of the principles of thought implied in natural science, such as is given by Professor Karl Pearson in his *Grammar of Science*, or by Professor A. Riehl in his *Philosophischer Kriticismus*. The second is closely allied to this, namely, *the pragmatic method in philosophy*, which is an epistemological instead of a metaphysical method, as exhibited in the writings of Professor James, of Harvard, and, pre-eminently, of Dr. F. G. S. Schiller, of Oxford. Applied with discrimination these two methods will, properly considered, make "an untrammelled return to the Christian sources in the light of *modern thought*" possible, and further continuance in the methods of *The New Theology* impossible.

NEWTON H. MARSHALL.

FAITH IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

THE interest taken in the many questions which gather round the Fourth Gospel in these days is very great. It is indicated by the large number of books and treatises on this subject which have recently appeared. One of the most remarkable of these is that written by Mr. E. F. Scott. It is entitled *The Fourth Gospel* and is published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark.

In a very suggestive book, which reveals wide reading and great ability, Mr. Scott naturally has much to say on the subject of faith or "believing" as it appears in this Gospel. He says:

The word faith,—the keyword of S. Paul's theology,—is absent from the Gospel. Instead of it we have a continual repetition of the word "believe" in all its various forms. But this believing has little in common with the Pauline faith. Itself it signifies only an intellectual assent, and has to be filled out and supplemented before it can be made to connote the larger meaning.

The Johannine knowledge includes certain spiritual and ethical elements which make it equivalent in some degree to the Pauline "faith." At the same time the fact is significant that John describes the supreme energy of the religious life as an act of knowledge (17. 3). The intellectual idea, combined though it is with the ethical and spiritual, is still present and indeed determinative. A value is thus assigned to knowledge which affects the whole theology of the Gospel. The purely religious view is overlaid and obscured by the conception of Christianity as a speculative system which makes the primary appeal to the logical intelligence. In this respect more clearly than in any other, the evangelist's attitude to Gnosticism appears to be one of sympathy.

Again, "The 'believing' so constantly insisted on by John is something much narrower and poorer than the Pauline Faith. It implies not so much an inward disposition of trust and obedience as the acceptance of a given dogma. To believe is to grant the hypothesis that Jesus was indeed the Christ, the Son of God." Mr. Scott recognizes "differentiating elements" in faith which go far to qualify the sweeping statements of other passages, but he goes on to say that "an examination of far the greater number of the passages in which the idea of knowledge is prominent confirms us in the assumption that the intellectual moment is the chief one in his mind."

Again, "True to his Greek prepossessions John regarded the activity of the reason as a chief factor in the attainment of the higher life." "Knowledge is one of the factors which precede and create belief." "Faith as described in the Synoptic teaching is simply the opening of the heart to God, and the humble and the childlike are the most capable of it." "The Johannine belief is the result of knowledge. It presupposes a mind fully enlightened and

equal to high speculations on the nature and Person of Christ.”

Now in all this we have conclusions drawn from the assumption that the Gospel belongs to an age separated from that of Christ by a whole century, and that it is coloured, if not formed, by the Gnosticism of that age. In face of the authorities so lightly set aside by Mr. Scott in his introduction this seems a large assumption. But we are not concerned in this paper directly with the question of authorship. We rather contend that if, as many scholars still hold, the Gospel belongs to an earlier age, we must look for other explanations of the relation of faith and knowledge to life ; and conversely, if other interpretations of these two great terms are forthcoming, a light may be cast back upon the authorship of the most fascinating book of the New Testament Scriptures.

Mr. Scott has compared the idea of faith in this Gospel with that which is presented to us in the Synoptic Gospels and in the writings of St. Paul. This suggests the true line to adopt in discussing the meaning of the word *πίστις* and its cognates ; and while there seems to be some amount of overlapping, it may nevertheless be contended that the three writings referred to indicate three distinct stages in the history of all that the words connote. It will appear, however, that so far from there being no connexion between Paul's use of the words and John's, there is the very closest connexion both in thought and construction, and the common element in the thought of the two writers was not intellectual but distinctly religious.

Πίστις in the Synoptic writings, then, seems in by far the great majority of cases to indicate mere belief in the power of Jesus to work miracles. The phrase *ἔχειν πίστιν* is frequent and appropriate. So slight was the personal religious element that where this belief existed

merely in the friends of the sufferer the response of our Lord was forthcoming.

It is difficult to believe that the woman who touched the hem of the Master's garment had anything more than this confidence in His healing power ; yet that which saved her was her "faith." This same faith appears also in the friends who bore the paralytic into the presence of Christ, and was equally effective. The centurion was confident that Christ had "authority" analogous to that which he possessed, and our Lord responded by declaring that He had not found such "faith" in Israel. So in the very early writing of St. James belief is mostly confidence, and may be shared by devils. In one passage (Luke xviii. 8) the word is used in a sense which approaches one of the many uses to be found in the writings of St. Paul. Here the constancy of the believer, the loyalty that endures in spite of repeated disappointment, is indicated. It was a confidence or loyalty evoked by Christ (*ἡ πίστις, ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ*, Acts iii. 16) ; but for the most part the Synoptists write as we have indicated. In all the passages taken from their writings it is to be observed that the grammatical construction of either verb or noun varies between the absolute use of the word and its use with the dative, the object being either a person or an utterance. In all this the usage of the Septuagint is closely followed. In spite of the construction with a preposition suggested by the Hebrew equivalent, the Seventy preferred to use the word without a preposition. Only in two instances (Matt. xviii. 6, and Luke. xxiv. 25) is this rule departed from by these writers. We shall return presently to the way in which these words are used in the later books of the New Testament, but we pass now to consider the form in which they appear in the Epistles of St. Paul. Here we notice almost immediately that faith seems to be AN ACT, and an act referring to Christ. AS A

PERSON. There are many passages which recall the use of the Synoptic Gospels, but there can be only one interpretation of the passage Romans iii. 22. Faith there is that which has Christ for its object. It is neither belief in His message, nor is it the confidence which He inspires, but it is that "enthusiastic personal adhesion" (Sanday and Headlam *in loc.*) by reason of which the believer realises that righteousness which his Master fulfilled, and which is revealed in the Gospel. This phrase in Romans iii. 22 is of special importance for the purpose of the present study because in Galatians ii. 16 the phrase is repeated, and another phrase is used as an alternative expression with it. This phrase is *εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν πιστεύειν*, and it is the very expression which plays so prominent a part in the Fourth Gospel.

So again in Philippians i. 29 Paul uses the Johannine phrase to express the act which brings a man into living union with his Lord, and enables him to "commit himself" to Him.

But if we abandon for a moment the significance which may or may not lie in grammatical construction, we find the element of faith which, as we hold, distinguishes the writings of both Paul and John in that example which plays so prominent a part in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. The whole significance of the Faith of Abraham, of the act which marked him out as the "Father of the Faithful," lies, not so much in his belief of the message which had come to him from God, as in the crowning act of will in which he broke away from all the traditions of his clan, accepted the uncertainties of the future, and was content to run all risks with God. He made himself one with the Divine will, as he conceived it, and his truer life issued from that sublime act of self-surrender (Rom. i. 17, Gal. iii. 11).

When in after days the great Apostle had before him the still longer journey into the unknown, he too could speak of "Him whom he had believed." It was no body of dogma that he accepted then. With faithful Abraham he took "the risks of faith," and thus made one with his Lord he entered into life. To Paul "faith" was far from being an intellectual assent. In one passage he speaks of it as "sacrifice and service" (Phil. ii. 17). It was the spiritual rapture of the priest, and the unreckoned generosity of the patriot. In each term an act rather than a conviction is before us: each reveals the enthusiasm of a willing self-surrender. The intense personal enthusiasm of St. Paul may be accounted for on the supposition that the faith which ruled his life possessed this element of self-surrender. It cannot be accounted for on any other interpretation of faith.

When we come to examine "faith" as it is put before us in the Fourth Gospel we are met at once with the very remarkable fact that the noun πίστις is not used once throughout the Gospel. It is the only book in the New Testament of which this can be said, and the omission cannot be other than significant. In the First Epistle of John the word appears, but only once, and then it is used to denote a conquering power, a "victory which overcometh the world" (1 John v. 4). In the Apocalypse the word appears four times; and, if the Johannine authorship is allowed, it is significant that in what must have been the earliest work of John the word is used as we have seen it used in the Synoptic Gospels to indicate rather the fidelity of the believer, the constancy of trust. But in the Fourth Gospel the noun is not used in a single passage. Mr. Scott appears to think that the writer preferred the word for knowledge as coming nearer to that Gnostic element which he finds throughout the Gospel. But this not only presupposes

that there is a Gnostic element in the Gospel, but also it takes for granted an interpretation of the word *γινώσκειν* which we are far from accepting. But to return to the use of *πιστεύειν* in our Gospel. It occurs in a variety of constructions. It is used absolutely thirty times, and the meaning of the verb in each of these passages must be sought in its context. The word is used with *ὅτι*, as indicating the credence to be given to a message, nine times. With the simple Dative (the Septuagint construction) it is used eighteen times; and with the preposition *εἰς* it is used no less than thirty-four times. The constructions with *ἐν* and *ἐπί*, as indicating the sphere and the basis of trust, do not seem to be needed by the writer. The construction with *εἰς* is the more remarkable because it is not found in either the Septuagint or Classical Greek. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that John must have adopted it of set purpose, and the question which follows inevitably will be, What was that purpose? Now it is possible to prove that the preposition in question had lost so much of its proper meaning as to stand in Hellenistic Greek for little more than what is connoted by the preposition *ἐν*. But against this we must set the fact that there are fewer cases of *εἰς* with the meaning of *ἐν* in John than in any other book of the New Testament (Blass, p. 122), and that if *εἰς* is so weakened, yet in New Testament times *ἐν* had greatly "enlarged its sphere of influence" (Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 62), and might therefore be expected to be used along with *εἰς*. We are not therefore straining a point when we give to the preposition its proper value, and take the Apostle to indicate by this marked and frequent use the idea of intimate union, of spiritual incorporation with Christ, as the condition of life eternal (John iii. 36). In John i. 12 we have the expression used as synonymous with *ἔλαβον αὐτὸν*, and it is clear that the one expression

and the other bring before us a closer, more mystical union than could ever be implied by mere intellectual assent. After all this use of the verb with the preposition is strictly parallel with that of *παραδίδωμι* (Matt. x. 17, 2 Cor. iv 11, Rom. i. 24).

In all of these we have the complete abandonment of one person to another, or of an individual to some power or principle. We must also compare the use of *γενέσθαι εἰς*, Luke, xiii. 9, and the even better known example given us in the Baptismal formula, *βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* (Matt. xxviii. 19).

The preposition indicates movement; the movement of the individual from the position in which self is everything to that in which he finds everything, even life itself, in Christ. It is clear that in all this we come very near to the Pauline view of faith as "an enthusiastic personal adhesion" to Christ. It is the first step in that spiritual movement which results in the life described by Paul as one that is lived in Christ, and by means of faith (Gal. ii. 2).

The Fourth Gospel gives us, then, not only a remarkable construction of this word, but a frequency of use which is even more remarkable. Dr. Abbott, in his complete and most scholarly analysis of this word (*Johannine Vocabulary*, pp. 19-82), says: "The writer exhibits 'believing' in so many different phases, attributes it in many different places to so many persons and classes, assigns so many sayings about it to our Lord Himself, and makes so many evangelistic comments about it in his own person, that a summary of the Johannine dicta about 'believing,' amounting almost to a summary of the Gospel itself, may give a clue to its scheme and motive."

There are few more interesting studies in the New Testament than that of "faith" as it is set before us in this Gospel, but it would demand more space than we have at

our disposal to examine the different illustrations of faith which St. John gives us. Nor indeed could we do more than go over ground already completely covered by Dr. Abbott. We may, however, refer here to two passages. In chapter viii. 30, 31 we read that many believed in Him. Here the construction with *εἰς* is used, but in the very next verse the construction is altered, and we have the Dative, followed by the word *Ἰουδαίους* in such a position that it would seem as though the thought in the mind of the writer might be rendered "those who had believed Him yet remained Jews," and this is followed by a description of these last as men who sought to kill Him and who, Christ said, "were of their father the devil." There seem, then, to be two classes of adherents represented here : those who had entered into true fellowship with Christ, and those who had believed in the truth of what He said while they retained the most violent personal antagonism to Him. The latter was the intellectual acceptance ; the former suggests a spiritual fellowship. In the twentieth chapter we have what was in all probability the close and culmination of this presentation of faith as John conceived it. For while we may believe that the author of the twenty-first chapter was the writer of the preceding chapters, it is obvious that that chapter was written as a postscript. In the story of Thomas, then, we have the climax of different phases of faith. Surely here we have the sharpest antagonism between the religious and the intellectual acceptance of faith. We cannot believe that Thomas accepted the intellectual evidence conceded by his gracious Lord. No one can imagine him proceeding to examine the pierced feet and hands, or drawing aside the Saviour's garments to examine the wounded side. The sympathy and condescension of his Lord were enough ; with one bound he reached the highest ascription of trust that is recorded in the Gospels in the cry, "My Lord and

my God." Yet even thus there had been a partial concession to the demand of the intellect; and as though He would remove it entirely, the Saviour proceeds to declare the higher blessing of those who had not seen and yet had believed. Then follows the purpose of the writer in the familiar conclusion, "These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life in His name."

It is quite true, as Mr. Scott says, that John uses *γινώσκειν* and *πιστεύειν* almost as alternatives. In vi. 69 and x. 38 the two verbs are thrown together in a very suggestive collocation. Mr. Scott concludes from this that the true content of *πιστεύειν* is knowledge, but it is at least equally demonstrable that faith is the true content of *γινώσκειν*. In such passages as Galatians iv. 9 and 1 Corinthians ii. 11 and John i. 24, and others too numerous to mention, *γινώσκειν* "includes the ideas of thoroughness, familiarity, and approbation" (Lightfoot). It is used to indicate "knowledge of the inner nature of a thing" (Edwards). It is "the result of an insight which comes from a perfect spiritual sympathy" (Westcott). In this light the great definition of "eternal life" given by our Lord (xvii. 2) wears a very different appearance from that given by Mr. Scott. It is not the "knowledge" of a second century Gnosticism, but rather that intimate knowledge which is born of spiritual sympathy and which more than anything else indicates the perfect fellowship in which the heart of one lies open to the enraptured gaze of another. It is a conception which belongs to the Hebrew much more than to the Greek. It tells us that the author was steeped in Jewish ideas, not that he was phrasing the ideas common in the Platonic School of Alexandria. The "knowledge of the Lord" in the Old Testament spells love and communion far more than intellectual apprehension. The Psalms are full of the idea that

there is a knowledge as between God and man which stands for oneness of thought and purpose and love. Could there be any more inspiring or inspired description of "eternal life" than this!

Even the doctrine of the Logos, upon which so much turns in this Gospel, has far more of a Hebrew connotation than a Greek. It is akin to the whole conception of "Wisdom" as the Jew conceived it, and carries far more of the idea of personality than that of intellectuality. That such terms as this should appear in the Gospel need not indicate a sympathetic presentation of Gnosticism. No one will hold that because Gnostic expressions appear in the Epistle to the Colossians Paul must be considered to be introducing Gnostic ideas in a Christian garb. The motive of the Fourth Gospel, as we conceive it, is neither doctrinal nor ecclesiastical. It has to do with neither the establishing of a creed, nor the enforcing of hierarchical authority. Its aim is distinctly religious. It is such a presentation of faith as was needed in an age in which the word was beginning to be used for a "creed" (Jude 3), an age in which Greek thinkers "considered that it came to them through syllogism or induction" (Abbott), and when in the Christian Church it might seem as though some restatement was necessary in view of the seemingly opposed views of Paul and James. That restatement John comes to offer. Faith, he says, is no creed, no mental conviction. It is an act. It is found in that determination of the will which surrenders the individual to Him who is his Lord and his God. It is

The submission of Man's nothing-perfect to God's all-complete,
As by each new obeisance of spirit I climb to His feet.

We climb to reach even His *feet*. But He does not leave us there. He lifts us up; opens His heart to us, until in the perfect knowledge of God man finds "the life which is life indeed."

W. W. HOLDSWORTH.

A CHRISTIAN CITY IN THE BYZANTINE AGE.

IF the question were put what was the practical effect exerted on the people in Asia Minor by the teaching and organization of the Christian Church, after its triumph during the fourth and following centuries, it would not be easy to reply except in vague generalities and assumptions. What was the condition, the education, the standard of life, of the ordinary people in the towns and villages? I know of no serious attempt to answer the question. The material for an answer is very slight, for the historians of the Byzantine Empire have their attention almost wholly devoted to Emperors and courtiers and generals, while the ecclesiastical historians in similar fashion write chiefly about bishops and councils and church leaders and heresies. The private letters of the period, which have been preserved, contain more information in an incidental rather than an intentional fashion. The literary material, however, has never been collected and valued.¹ Epigraphic material is practically non-existent.

In the present year we have had the opportunity of adding to the range of evidence available in this problem by a careful examination of a city whose modern name is sufficient proof of its ecclesiological interest, as it is now currently called "the Thousand and One Churches" (Bin-

¹ In the writer's *Pauline and Other Studies*, the last paper contains a sketch of the material contained in Basil's *Letters*, but there is great need for a much fuller study of the Letters and other works from this point of view. The Byzantine and Roman Law-books also require to be studied and compared with the works of the ecclesiastical writers.

Bir-Kilisse), though its proper official name is "City of Mines" (Maden-Sheher). We found ourselves thus brought into close relations with a simple Anatolian town of the Byzantine period, whose ecclesiastic character continued from the fourth century (if not earlier)¹ down to the final destruction of Byzantine society by the Turks some time after A.D. 1072. It was not a town of Hellenized type. It seems to have lain apart from the main currents of Greek and Roman civilization, and to have been only very slightly affected by Greek education. The impression made on me is that even the Greek language came into use only in a Christian form, and that apart from Christianity Greek had never succeeded in producing any real effect on the city; but this is only a personal impression, and the evidence is not sufficient to prove that such was the case. But at least it is quite clear that here the Christian teaching and manners were introduced among a non-Hellenic and entirely native Anatolian population, the commonplace average rustic people who formed the mass and the ground-stock of the population of the central plateau generally.

This city was, therefore, up to a certain point, a fair specimen of the ordinary Anatolian class, though there were, of course, in this (as in every case) special conditions which gave a certain individuality and distinction to it, and differentiated it from other Anatolian rustic townships. It lay in the heart of Lycaonia, and may be regarded as the most typical example of a Lycaonian city, with the minimum of Greek and Roman influence affecting it. The Christian city was the offspring of the pre-Christian city; and the history and circumstances of the older city determined to a large degree the fate and character of the later. Behind everything else the peculiar and very

¹ Stephen, bishop of Barata, was present at the Council of Nicaea A.D. 325.

marked situation of the city was the determining factor in its history.

The city, called Barata or Barathra, "the Pits," was situated in a rounded valley on the northern skirts of the Kara-Dagh, "Black-Mountain," with hills closing it in to east and west and north-east, and the highest peak of the mountain rising behind it on the south, about 7,000 feet above the sea and 3,000 above the city.¹ The mountain is entirely volcanic. There is a large oval crater on the north-west side of the highest peak, measuring about two or three miles long²; and several smaller craters, large deep pits, about one quarter of a mile across with perpendicular sides, are met with in different parts of the mountain, two (called Maden, "Mines," by the Turks) being in the hill on the west (or north-west) side of the town. The word "Maden" is applied by the Turks to any mine or quarry³: it also indicates the metal or valuable material found in the mine. These deep holes in the Maden-Dagh look like quarries, and at the first glance I supposed them to be quarries; but this opinion had to be abandoned. The holes seem to be natural. They are also called Geuzlar, "the Eyes"; and the hill is often called Geuz-Dagh.

¹ Our American friends of the Cornell expedition estimated the height by aneroid as only 6,000. I ascended the peak three times, and my aneroid gave the height on all three occasions very close to 3,900 ft. above Konia. Now Konia is fixed by the Anatolian railway measurements exactly 1,027 metres above the sea (about 3,370 feet).

² It is difficult to estimate by eye; and, on the steep rough path round the crater, the time occupied is a bad criterion. Sometimes walking, generally riding, and ascending the highest peak, but keeping along the shoulder of the other peaks that fringe the crater, we took fully four hours to go round it. Three miles NE. to SW., and two miles across NW. to SE., is, I think, a fair estimate. The crater lip is only 300 feet above the bottom on NW., but far higher on all other sides, and the peaks rise 1,500 to 2,000 feet above the bottom. It is grassy and on the sides bushy, with low trees, fruit trees and others.

³ The Latin word *metallum* has the same wide range of meaning as the Turkish "Maden."

On account of these two deep pits, this hill is called Maden-Dagh by the modern population, and the city is called Maden-Sheher, "the town of the Maden."¹ As there are no mines known in the whole Kara-Dagh, the reason for the name Maden-Sheher was obscure, until we observed the two pits called Maden and the hill Maden-Dagh at the edge of the city. Then it became clear that the modern name is only the translation of the ancient name Barathra, and probably Barata was the Anatolian word equivalent to the Greek Barathra.

In the modern Turkish language, as my wife discovered, there is sometimes used a word Varta, which is said to be borrowed from the Arabic²; its original meaning was "abyss," but it is now only used in Turkish to mean "danger." Possibly there may have been some connexion between the Anatolian Barata (pronounced Varata in Roman time) and the Semitic Varta.

The most striking and unusual feature of the locality, the deep craters with their almost perpendicular sides, gave rise both to the Greek and to the modern name. The Greek name Barathra was apparently used on the map of the Empire prepared under Augustus.³ The native name Barata is not known earlier than the second century; but we may suppose that it was the older term, displaced for a time in official documents by the Greek name Barathra (which we conjecture to be merely a translation of the older

¹ Bin-Bir-Kilisse, "Thousand and One Churches," is merely a descriptive term, used by the outer world, but not by the natives of the town.

² It is a rare word in Turkish, known to few. A proverb was quoted to us by Husni Pasha, an educated and exiled Turk, "This is not a varta that cannot be crossed," of a difficulty which one boldly faces. The German Consul in Konia, a good Orientalist, after some research, gave me the information stated in the text. But Miss Bell and Professor Sayce do not think that Varta can be an Arabic word. The latter is disposed to think that it may be Aramaic. I leave the decision to Orientalists.

³ This is inferred from the fact that Barathra is the name used on the Peutinger Table, which ultimately rests on the great Imperial map.

and later Barata). Professor Sayce suggests that Varta or Varata may be an Aramaic word. If so, we may expect to find that there was a still older Hittite or Lycaonian name for the town, and that this oldest name likewise had the same meaning as the later names.

The important Roman road from Iconium to Thebasa (Kale-Keui) and Cybistra, forking thereafter to Tyana and to the Cilician Gates, passed on the north side of the "Black Mountain"; and by this road the distance from Iconium to Barata is given in the Table as fifty Roman (about forty-six English) miles.

Barata was situated in this oval recess of the mountain, looking out to the north, a typically Lycaonian position,¹ similar to the sites of Laodiceia Combusta, Savatra, and Isaura Nova. The valley slopes gently back towards the mountain on the south; and the city is double, one part in the middle of the valley, the other higher up towards the south-west. The latter is probably the original fortified city. The other grew in times of peace, when the lower ground was more convenient; and on its northern side are many sarcophagi and graves of other forms. One may conjecture that a temple with many graves round it existed here from early time.

There is no more striking example anywhere of the degeneration of the Mediterranean lands than here. As the degeneration of the Mediterranean lands was described in general terms, and assumed as the basis of reasoning, in the EXPOSITOR, June, 1907, pp. 559 ff., we may here devote a page to show how the degeneration has been brought about in this special case.

The ancient city was, as we shall see, rich and abundantly supplied with all comforts from its own soil. The modern town, or rather village, is one of the most wretched

¹ See the *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 86.

in the whole of Turkey. There are now only about thirty families in it; and I do not think that we saw so many children. The Moslem population, as so often in Turkey, is dying out. In earlier Turkish time it was much larger. There is no drinking-water in the village. A certain small amount of half-poisonous water and melted snow is stored in a few filthy ancient cisterns; but there is barely enough to quench the thirst of the scanty population during the summer. A stranger cannot drink this water except at the risk of serious illness. Yet there was formerly abundant water, brought to the village by an aqueduct carried under the ground in terra-cotta pipes laid on a concrete bed. The aqueduct has been allowed to fall into ruin, for nothing is ever repaired in Turkey; and there is not sufficient energy or enterprise to restore it; in fact, government would repress any attempt in the village to combine for this or for any other purpose, while it is not efficient enough itself to undertake this necessary work. Nothing is grown round the village except a good deal of corn and some melons or vegetable marrows; and some half-wild fruit is gathered from degenerate trees growing naturally on the hillsides. There is no terracing; as the water falls in rain or melts from the snows of winter, it runs rapidly off the steep slopes and does no good to the soil.

Want of water, due to ignorance and sluggishness, is the ruin of the modern town. The water supply of the ancient city, which was the foundation of its prosperity and of its habitability, was of three kinds.

(1) The springs of the Kara-Dagh are not numerous nor abundant; but there are two within a few miles of the city,¹ and the water of the nearest certainly, probably

¹ I leave out of count other two springs, Geuk-Bunar and Kavakli-Bunar, as they are not perennial. They are about two miles west of the city, on the north side of the lip of the great crater. It is said that they

of both, was conducted to the city by conduit. Doubtless this was reserved for drinking, and it would afford a perennial supply of ever-running water.

(2) A system of cisterns on quite a vast scale served to store rain and snow water. These cisterns are seen throughout the double city.

(3) The water of the streams was doubtless stored up by means of dams. Except after heavy rain, the stream beds are quite dry ; but a large amount of water must run down from the mountains in early spring. I noticed remains of one dam across a small watercourse on the north-west side and two water-chambers across two dry ravines, some miles south and south-west of the city. A careful examination would throw considerable light on the method of storing the water ; but it would require a very accurate map of the whole district and would take much longer time than we could devote to it. The means employed seem to have been very simple ; no large engineering work was required ; a series of small dams must have served better for irrigation than a few large dams, and the water thus stored would be more easily controlled. The dams, being small and probably roughly made, have doubtless been for the most part washed away since the irrigation system fell into disuse and decay.

(4) Generally there are a considerable number of thunderstorms in the later spring and early summer ; and this source of supply, though precarious, is generally sufficient to nurture the very light crops with which the natives are contented at the present time ; but the area cultivated and the amount of crops grown per acre would be greatly increased by the storage of water and the artificial irrigation practised in ancient time.

In striking contrast with the modern wilderness of neglect

flow only while the lake in the bottom of the great crater lasts. This year Geuk-Bunar was dry in June, but Miss Bell saw it flowing in May.

and poverty was the ancient aspect of the country. For several thousand years Barata was evidently a sort of sanatorium and Elysium for the surrounding country. The Kara-Dagh is, as it were, an island in the level plain of Lycaonia, cultivable in varying degrees and ways to the highest summit, offering cool glades and pastures, a delightful resort for man and animals in the heat of summer. The Lycaonian plain is treeless. The mountain still grows trees, and might grow many more; on the north side of the highest peak is quite a forest. Yet even the trees are an example of the deterioration of the country and the soil: many of them are fruit trees which have degenerated and become wild and poor.

This contrast between the bare and barren hillsides in modern time and their rich, highly cultivated condition in ancient time is an essential fact in the right understanding of the old city. The district has in a large degree gone back to its original condition, though showing plentiful traces of the improved state in which it was for centuries and even for thousands of years. How was this improvement effected? The remarkable thing is not merely that so much labour had to be expended on the improving of the soil: far more impressive is it to think of the wisdom, the forethought, the sacrificing of the present to the future, the accumulated experience and knowledge, which lie behind the process. How was the engineering skill gained, which stored up every drop of water that fell in the rainy season for use in the dry season? There is still the same amount of water, but it runs off the slopes as quickly as it falls, and is of very small service to the soil or to man. The people who still inhabit the town¹ are of much the same

¹ The people of the town of Maden-Sheher (Bin-Bir-Kilisse) consider themselves Osmanli or Turks, not Turkmen or Yuruk. Those of Deghile are Yuruk settled in recent years and no longer nomadic. On the dis-

race, and of much the same character, as the population of old. They are industrious. What they want is knowledge, and not willingness to work. They have died out down to the measure of the food that they can grow, and are now dying out still further from the dearth of water. They have not the knowledge, or skill, or forethought, or power of adapting means to ends, which would give them more food and better water to drink. The fruit trees in ancient times were the result of careful cultivation and much care; but the art of tending them is lost. It takes a long time to produce a good orchard, and requires a people who can work for a distant future, and who can count on security of property and peace to enjoy the fruits of labour in the distant future. This implies settled government, order and the reign of law. Those conditions are all wanting now. Such considerations show how the whole fabric of society has deteriorated in the course of 3,000 years.

But the question has still to be answered, how it was that essentially the same people¹ acted with such forethought and knowledge in ancient times, and now show such ignorance and short-sightedness. The reason seems not to have lain in any high standard of education in this Lycaonian city. We have found no reason to think that the people were ever anything but rustics; they seem to have been

tion between the Turkmens, Yuruks, etc., on the one hand, who are all nomads of Central Asiatic stock, and the Turks on the other hand, who are practically the ancient population with an admixture of the Turkish conquering element, which has been merged in the former population, see *Impressions of Turkey*, pp. 96-109. The Turkmens and other nomads are as old as the Turkish conquest of the land (some tribes however, are later immigrants).

¹ There seems no reason to think that the Seljuk Turks affected the city population much; and the nomads who swamped the whole plain around did not establish themselves on the site of the city, which gradually decayed as civilization and skill died out in the deteriorating and dwindling people.

unused to employ the art of writing, and they have left remarkably few proofs of their capacity to write, showing in this a noteworthy contrast to the Hellenized cities of the country and to the Greek cities proper. In this respect one may well doubt whether the old Lycaonian rustics were very much superior to those of the present day. It was not through the high education of the individual that those great results in engineering and agriculture and the use of the earth generally were gained. It was through the guiding power of their religion. The Goddess herself, the Mother Earth, taught her children; as she gave them birth and life and nourishment, so she showed them how to use the things that she tendered to the use of man. The religion was agricultural and economic; and its rules and practices were the annual cycle of events in the industrial year.

In this way that ancient religion acquired an extraordinarily strong hold on the simple minds of a little-educated population. In their religion lay their sole education; but it prescribed to them all the wisdom and the conduct that they needed for a prosperous agricultural life.¹ The hold which it possessed on their minds lasted through the centuries that followed, when new rulers and strange religions became dominant in the land. The old holy places, perhaps also the old religious customs to some extent, imposed themselves on the Christians of the Byzantine time; and it is not easy to see any great or deep difference between the Byzantine saints and the Divine figures who surrounded the principal deity in the early religion.

I have assumed that the town grew at a period long anterior to Greek or Roman influence in the country (Greek influence beginning about 330 B.C.). But the question must be formally raised, in what period should the origin of

¹ This subject is treated in more detail in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, v., pp. 109 ff.

this prosperity in the Black Mountain be placed? Must we suppose that it began in the Roman time, or is it of far more ancient date? There is no third alternative, as Greek influence here was evidently quite unimportant.

As to this, there is no doubt. Already in the old Hittite time Barata was a flourishing city. In the town itself we found little to prove its age definitely, for the terms of our firman permitted no deep excavation, but only the clearing up of the lines of buildings and the making of trial-holes: hence we nowhere could go down to the early stratum of city life. A few scraps of pre-Greek pottery, and scanty traces of the fortifications of a character certainly pre-Hellenic, are the only indication of the early period of Barata found on the site; but they show that we have not here to deal with a city of the Greek period. Neither inscription nor any other sign can be found of the Greek time or of Greek origin. The Roman period at Barata follows immediately on the Anatolian. The place was an old Anatolian foundation, with nothing of the Hellenic character and showing no traces of Hellenic city life and municipal organization.

Hence the town is perhaps slurred over in Acts xiv. 6 as a mere country place, not a city at all.¹ Paul and Barnabas fled to "the cities of Lycaonia, Derbe and Lystra, and the surrounding region." In the Roman region of Lycaonia there were only two cities and a rude Anatolian rustic region; and the Apostles' work was confined to the two cities.

¹ There remains always a doubt whether this district was comprised in Lycaonia Galatica (the part of the Roman province in which Paul sought refuge) or in Lycaonia Antiochiana (which was under the rule of King Antiochus and is not taken notice of in Acts). If it was in Lycaonia Galatica, it is part of the "surrounding region" (τὴν περίχωρον) mentioned in Acts xiv. 6: in the text I have spoken as if it were so; but this cannot be taken as at all certain. In the map attached to a careful study of Lycaonia published in the Austrian *Jahreshefte* 190, pp. 57-131, I have

Outside the city the evidence is more conclusive. On the highest point of the mountain, a peak called Mahalitch or Mahlitch, looking out on all sides over a vast stretch of country, is a Hittite inscription, evidently of hieratic character. Remembering the ancient idea that lofty peaks were sacred, no one can doubt that here was a "high place" of the early Anatolian religion. Unfortunately, the permanence of religious awe attaching to special places in Anatolia caused an almost complete recasting of the old sanctuary. The revival of the old paganism under Christianized forms in the Orthodox Church, which was so marked a feature of the fourth and following centuries, can be observed here in a very clear fashion. About the sixth century a monastery and a church and a small chapel, "the memorial of Leo," as it is called in an inscription on the apse, were built on the summit; and this great series of constructions almost completely obliterated the earlier features.

Almost the only relic now visible of the original "High Place" is a narrow passage in the rocks, partly cut and partly natural, close underneath the Christian Church on the north side. On its rock walls two Hittite inscriptions show its original character. A Byzantine wall was built along part of one of the sides of this passage; and it is probable that in Christian times these inscriptions were concealed by building or in other ways, at the time when all the higher part of the sanctuary was destroyed and built over. This monument, discovered by Miss Bell¹ in May, 1907, after so many travellers had visited the site of Barata, is one of the best examples of the general principle which

marked the frontier between Galatic and Antiochian Lycaonia as passing through Barata, to indicate the uncertainty.

¹ Miss Bell was our collaborator in the study of this site; and the most important part of the work, the study of the Byzantine architecture as shown in sixty churches, was done entirely by her.

we have often described—that religious awe clung permanently to the same localities.¹ There can be no doubt that the church and monastery were placed here because of the old sacred character. The new religion was obliged to satisfy the religious instincts of the population, which revered this ancient seat of worship. The church and monastery have every appearance of being comparatively early: the fifth or at least the sixth century is the date to which they should be assigned. The Byzantine type of architecture with dome standing within a square tower was already fully developed when the church was built; hence one would not be able to date the foundation back to the fourth century²: on other grounds one would like to place it as early in the monastic period as possible.

The monastery and church belong to the age of monasticism, initiated in the fourth century but lasting long. Those who founded the monastery on this lofty peak, about 7,000 feet above the sea, were prepared to face a very rigorous and long winter, when the monks must have been almost buried in snow for months. The cold of those bare stone buildings must have been extreme. A long covered passage leads from the south-east corner of the monastery to the church, which it enters through a door in the south wall of the narthex. At a later date, but probably not much later, a small memorial chapel north-west from the church was built in honour of a certain Leo. It is of cruciform plan, and is also connected by a covered passage with the church. But as the builders did not like to interfere with the architecture of the church, they added an outer narthex to the church, and made the covered passage enter the north wall of this exo-narthex. The

¹ Especially *Pauline and other Studies*, p. 163 ff.

² Many would on this ground forthwith relegate the church to a later date. We are not of this opinion.

chapel bears on the apse outside the inscription "the memory of Leo," and inside a long but mutilated and undecipherable inscription, of which I could read only "by the vow of Callinicus . . . to Leo . . ." One may conjecture that Leo was the builder of the monastery and church, as there seems no reason to place a long interval between the two constructions. As the name of Leo stands alone also on the apse of a church in the lower town and on a boundary stone east of the mountain, we may also conjecture that he was a leading person, doubtless a bishop, of Barata.

This site on the central point of the mountain would alone be a complete proof of the ancient origin of its civilization. But it was our good fortune to find a second almost more striking confirmation of the Hittite occupation. On the north-west side an outlying hill, called Kizil Dagħ, about eight or nine miles from the city, was made into a fortress to defend the approach to the central city. The ancient origin of this fortress is shown by its style, and its Hittite character is proved by four hieroglyphic inscriptions, one on a sort of altar near a gate in the west wall, and three on a "Holy Place," a pinnacle of rock forty feet high, carved into the shape of a seat or throne with high back, below the west wall. On the throne is incised a figure of the god, sitting, holding a sceptre in the left hand and a cup in the right.¹ He wears magnificent robes and rests his feet on a footstool. He is the god who presides over and guards the city of the mountain, with its bounteous vineyards, its wine, its fruit trees, its riches, and its cool, delightful climate in summer. The discovery of this throne would have

¹ Professor Sayce tells me that he interprets differently the symbol which I took for a cup; but this is immaterial for our present purpose. He regards the seated figure as that of the priest-king; but in that case, according to the usual practice, the priest wears the dress and plays the part of the god.

gladdened the heart of the German scholar (the late Dr. Reichel, if my memory is correct), who wrote from very slender materials a most suggestive paper on the importance of the throne in early Anatolian religion. We have been able this year to confirm his views by several monuments of the same class. A throne played a very important part in the equipment of the primitive cultus in Anatolia. The name of the same priest-king, Tarkuattes, appears in the inscriptions on both these Hittite sites, as Professor Sayce informs me. This priest-king must have been the dynast either of Barata or of some remoter city to which Barata was subject, and the former seems far the more probable supposition.

These brief notes are enough to give the reader some conception of the heritage which fell to the lot of the Christian population of Barata. They were heirs to a prosperity gained by industry and knowledge and science. They were heirs also to a religious belief deep engrained in their hearts through generations, a reverence for the religion to whose teaching they owed the beginning and the foundations of their prosperity: they owed to it also the conservation of their prosperity, for those numerous engineering works had to be kept in good repair, and we must suppose that this duty also was part of the ritual of the early religion. The deity who taught them became an inalienable part of the national mind and temperament; and the Christians could not get free from their heritage of belief and reverence,¹ nor would it have been right to force them to throw off all their inherited ideas, fixed in their nature through countless generations. If we knew more about them, we might be able to trace the new form which all the old ideas assumed in Byzantine times. As it is, we can at least trace the form in a few cases.

¹ See *Pauline and other Studies*, pp. 136 ff.

In one branch of the subject we found important evidence and that of a kind which was quite new to me. The religious importance attaching to the preparation of a grave is the most striking and the most permanent feature of Anatolian religion. No sacred place from the most ancient time down to the Moslem Turbe at the present day seems to have been complete in popular estimation unless it was consecrated by a grave.¹ In a general way we knew (or felt certain from the whole situation and circumstances) that the graves of Christian martyrs or heroes² were used in the same fashion to consecrate and protect sacred localities. Here in Barata we find the facts set out in detail before us.

W. M. RAMSAY.

(*To be continued.*)

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

A FEW years ago the editor of one of our best journals of theology, with a rare ability to discern the signs of the times, told us that in his judgment the problem certain to tax most sorely the Christian Apologetic of this generation is the problem created by the science of Comparative Religion. His foresight has been justified. Indeed, the present situation of theology exemplifies the justice of the aphorism—Mr. Balfour's, I think—that nothing changes its form so rapidly as Apologetic, unless it be the negative assault which Apologetic has to meet. Christian doctrine is being challenged to-day to justify immemorial claims of

¹ On this topic much may be found in various parts of *Studies in the History of the Eastern Provinces*, 1906: see pp. 27 ff., 289, also pp. 65, 79, 81, 89, 122, 142, 146, 193: also *Pauline and other Studies*, p. 179.

² It is not necessary to suppose that the martyr was really buried at the church which his memory consecrated.

a unique kind—the claim to stand by itself, and to deal with a subject-matter which is the measure of all value and all reality. It is encountering the objection, not new in substance, but new in tone, that there are many other voices in the world than the voice of Galilee, and that none of them is without signification. Is not, men are asking, the outcome of an impartial examination of the needs and utterances of the religious consciousness simply this, that Christianity takes its place alongside of other faiths whose claims are scarcely less imperious, and that we remit to the future, and to the arbitrament of the struggle for existence, the open question as to its absolute pre-eminence and its possible replacement by a faith more perfect still?

At present, however, I do not propose to discuss this problem abstractly, or as it might be argued polemically by thinkers who decline the Christian name; we will consider it rather as it bears upon the present internal state of theology itself. A new school of writers, of remarkable and sometimes brilliant ability, has recently drawn together, bent on forcing this question to the front; and on the banner they have raised is inscribed the legend of a new *method*—“the Method of Comparative Religious History,” or, as it is in German, *die religionsgeschichtliche Methode*. Though not without adherents in this country—one may name Dr. J. G. Frazer and Dr. Percy Gardner—their main strength lies in Germany. Abandoning the reserved and individualistic habits of most German theologians in the past, they have deliberately addressed themselves to the larger public, with a striking measure of success, some of their shorter books having attained a really wide circulation. Several joint undertakings have issued from their united forces, such as a well known series of tracts for the people on Religious History, which has evoked from the positive party a counter series; a new popular commentary on the

books of the New Testament, with fresh translations and introductions, edited by Professor Johannes Weiss of Marburg; and a modern Handbook to the New Testament, comprising not only a closely-packed commentary on the whole, but an elaborate literary and historical introduction and a concluding volume of practical exposition, the entire work being under the editorship of Professor Hans Lietzmann of Jena. Names better known in Britain are those of Wernle, whose *Beginnings of Christianity* has made an impression here; Bousset, whose recently translated book on *Jesus* was much the most popular of the "Tracts on Religious History," and who had for some years been known as a distinguished expert in Jewish apocalyptic; Weinel, editor of still another series of minor works upon the problems of life, whose *St. Paul*, rendered into English within the past year, is a modern and telling, if not very profound, book; Gunkel, in some ways the most attractive of them all, though hitherto inaccessible to English readers; and Jülicher, whose *Introduction to the New Testament* was lately translated by Miss Ward, and whom his friends class with Wellhausen and Harnack for scholarly distinction. I have also been told that many of the younger men readily confess an intellectual debt to one whose name is all but unknown with us, Professor Eichhorn of Kiel, a Church historian whose literary work has been impeded by persistent ill-health, but whose conversation has planted germinative thoughts in other minds.

It may be worth our while to consider patiently what these men have to say, for, to quote Dr. Sanday, "what Germany is saying to-day, many circles in Europe and America will be saying to-morrow." The question they are dealing with is, briefly, the sources of New Testament teaching, and their common attitude may fairly be expressed in Gunkel's words. Christianity, he says, is

really a syncretistic religion ; or, as he puts it somewhat more precisely in another place, " the religion of the New Testament, in its origin and its shaping, fell under the influence of alien religions in important points, and even in some points that are essential." ¹ Protestants are familiar enough with the idea that the doctrine and practice of the Ancient Catholic Church, say in the third or fourth century, are nearly unintelligible unless we allow for strong forces of a pagan origin ; but what the modern school argues is that the mischief began much further back, and that things went wrong in the apostles' lifetime. The descent dates from the New Testament itself. Accordingly, we must put aside the presuppositions on which Biblical Theology has commonly rested ; we must, so to speak, withdraw the privileges of the New Testament, which is not " a holy island in the sea of history," but only part of the main continent of early Christian literature. Hence what we want instead of New Testament Theology is a history of primitive Christian thought, most of which is religion, not theology at all. Put the books of the New Testament back, it is said, into vital relation with the general religious phenomena of their time, exhibit them as pervaded with the human feeling and speculation about divine things of which the world was then full, and their contents will acquire a vividness and glowing reality which must be lacking when you insist on a kind of sacred insulation. Perhaps an example of this method at its best is Bousset's commentary on the Apocalypse published some ten years ago. The author does not merely ask what the Greek words mean ; he goes behind the words, and inquires, Where have all these figures come from, the seven spirits and the vials, the four and twenty living creatures, and the rest ? And he answers that not merely was much of this material ready-

¹ *Zum religionsgesch. Verständnis d. NT.*, p. 1.

furnished by Jewish tradition and long crystallized in the conventions of apocalyptic, but that it came to Jewish tradition ages before from Babylonian mythology. And other writers, with perhaps less judgment than Bousset, have since ranged through the New Testament declaring that in this and that and that other strain of doctrine they detect clear traces of the religions of Egypt, Syria, Persia, Greece,—alien theologumena which, through the medium of Judaism, have entered and gone to mould even apostolic thought.

So far we are within the domain of exegesis, but it is obvious that the same principles demand to be applied to systematic theology. And when they are so applied, as by an uncompromising thinker like Troeltsch, the result is rather staggering. Christian Theology, we are told, must give place to the general Science and Philosophy of Religion, Christianity ranking simply as one faith among the rest, though no doubt relatively higher than them all—to be analysed and estimated by the same historical and psychological methods as we employ in other parts of the field; and the re-arrangements which this indicates with tolerable plainness in the character and constitution of the Faculty of Theology in our Universities and Colleges should be at once carried out. This comparison of the religions of the world will determine our ultimate beliefs. So far the new school has not yet produced a Dogmatic, but already we can see what it will be like when we have it. It will be the outcome of a temper which is certainly more interested in religion than in doctrine, and in religion more as consisting of pious feeling, which is pretty much the same wherever you find it, than in any particular beliefs with which it may be associated. As one writer puts it: “the first and real object of theological science is religion proper; it is only after we have studied religious life itself that we ought to turn to in-

stitutions and doctrines, to church and theology, which are merely the deposits and excrescences of religion.”¹ Our first duty, in other words, is sympathetically to realize, and to describe with precision, the free, original movements of the soul, in their unspoiled freshness, refusing to linger by the stream of piety as its channel widens into settled creeds and institutions, and ascending to the very fountain of religion, where it wells up from the creative depths of primitive personal life. Feelings, moods, emotional consciousnesses or psychoses, which from their very nature spurn every attempt at doctrinal formulation,—these are the elements which really make up the religious experience or attitude in every age and land ; but if you try to distil them into theoretical conceptions, suitable to be arranged in orderly paragraphs, the inevitable upshot is a fatal loss of spontaneity and force. This is equally true of Christianity and of other faiths.

The general programme, then, is clear. If we take the two words “ Religious History ” and lay the stress on the adjective *religious*, we get one main principle of the modern school : their aim is to bring out the hopes, fears, wishes, prayers, raptures of piety as the primary element, and to put ideas, propositions, doctrines into the second and derivative place. It would scarcely be unjust to call the point of view aesthetic. If, however, we lay the stress on the substantive *history*, we get the other main principle : they are resolved upon the thorough-going application of scientific historical method in the study of religious language and religious thought. And by historical method is meant three things—the principle of *criticism*, or the repudiation of all traditional authority, the principle of *analogy*, by which phenomena far asunder in time and space are linked together, and the principle of *correlativity*, which is the foe of all

¹ Weinel, *Die Wirkungen d. Geistes u. d. Geister* p. v.

isolation whether of person or event, and insists upon the fact that history is a seamless robe, in which all threads are woven indissolubly together. Throughout the exposition of these principles by some of the more prominent writers we can trace the influence of the idea, more often tacitly followed than openly avowed, that historical methods will answer all the questions a theologian has any right to ask. Their conception of the realities with which history deals is likewise such that they really confine their attention to what we may call the immanent action of God, and turn their blind eye upon the fact of His supernatural transcendence, together with the possibility of miracle. To the idea of a religion that is absolute and final they prefer the thought of an infinite evolution.¹ It is probably due to the ecclesiastical situation in Germany that many of them should also have a good deal to say about the crying need to emancipate theology from the Church. The dignity and impartiality of science, it is said, is seriously compromised by the connexion. It is intolerable that the results of a scientific inquiry should really be decided beforehand by the interests of faith; they might just as well be announced at once without the formality of historical discussion. The notion that German critical theologians have ever been restrained by undue tenderness for the plain man's feelings is certainly one which possesses much of the charm of novelty, and may be humorously meant; but apart from individual extravagance, there is not a little in the protest with which we, as Protestants, can sympathize. Only in Romanism are theology and the decisions of the Church bound to coincide. But to any one who holds that religion is a per-

¹ Cf. Häring, *Dogmatik* (1906), p. 80. It is scarcely possible to speak too highly in praise of Häring's book. It is probably the most important general work in its department which we have had from Germany for the past fifteen years, with the possible exception of Kähler's *Wissenschaft*.

sonal affair, not an impersonal institution, it is not new that theology must be free to discover truth, and that if new facts are brought to light, the decisions of the Church must be modified accordingly. On the other hand, members of the modern school are rather prone to ill-considered observations as to the impossibility of a Church theology which shall also be genuinely scientific—an unreasoning position unless science means only pure mathematics.

Now, is it possible to point out formative influences which have gone to make this new theory? I think it is. The first place, obviously, must be given to the amazing growth of the science of Comparative Religion during the last fifty years. The impulse which this science received from Hegel is not yet spent, for despite the faultiness of much of his classification he did more than any other to introduce rational order into a study rather conspicuously in need of it. He taught men to range freely and seriously through religions other than their own, with some kind of clue in their minds. Then scientific philology has much to answer for; it has created noble collections like the Sacred Books of the East, and translated monuments and inscriptions in countless tongues. On every hand the field has been immensely widened. Old Testament study has opened out into Assyriology with its kindred disciplines. Much that is illuminating has been written upon the religions of classical antiquity. As long ago as 1889 the late German philologist Usener issued a work which, in the light of what has happened since, almost deserves to be styled epoch-making—his *Studies in Religious History*, in which he sought to retrace the paths which may be followed backward from our Christian present to the religious world of Greece and Rome. What has been doing for twenty years past to light up the confused pagan faiths of the Graeco-Roman civilization—the worships of Serapis, Baal, Mithras, Helios,

Jupiter—we may find in the works of a scholar like Professor Dill; and it reads like an exhumation of the soul. Furthermore, we have lately seen a remarkable elaboration and perfecting of historical method. Sympathetic fancy of a higher order has been applied to alien civilizations, the horizon of interest has been pushed back, a finer touch for psychological analysis has been developed, the sense of analogy is quickened; all, of course, with a reflex influence upon the study of religion. And when we look across into the neighbouring field of philosophy, we find a temper prevailing in many quarters which owes something to men like Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, with their fierce reaction against the prejudices and even the morality of the past, their sentimentality, their subtle and imaginative curiosity. Thus, to quote the words of one observer, there has grown up “a new romanticism, the intellectual spirit which is able and willing to think itself by feeling and imagination into any and every kind of mental experience, but neither able nor willing to find anywhere a firm resting-place and foothold, such as should make possible clear judgment and resolute progress.”¹ This is combined with a view of cosmic development which not only conflicts with the Christian faith in revelation, but is definitely constructed so as to bar it out. Evolution rules the world, and there is no more to be said. Take these influences together, and I think we have the main sources from which the presuppositions of the modern school are drawn. When the narrative of Christ’s life comes up for inspection, such things are bound to affect their estimate of the probability of a miracle, or the authenticity of a saying. They modify a man’s view of evidence.

It is the soul that sees: the outward eyes
Present the object; but the mind describes.

¹ Reischle, *Theologie u. Religionsgeschichte*, p. 16.

We are reminded of the caution urged by Dr. Hort : " Criticism is not dangerous except when, as in so much Christian criticism, it is merely the tool for reaching a result not itself believed on that ground, but on the ground of speculative postulates."

Beyond these, in the main, non-theological influences we can also trace a real connexion between the new theory and the theological system of Albrecht Ritschl. Roughly, but not unfairly, we may say that it represents the extreme left wing of Ritschlianism, and is the culmination of a good deal of discontent with some of the master's positions. Thus Ritschl always tended to isolate the revelation of God given in Jesus Christ, with a narrowness that disturbed people far more orthodox than he ; and it was not long before certain of his more impatient disciples began to feel the restriction intolerable. Once the first step in rebellion had been taken by linking afresh ties which bind the New Testament revelation to the Old, the question rose quite naturally as to the possibility of affiliating the Christian religion, at all events in part, to other ethnic faiths. Again, just because Ritschl made the person of Jesus so absolutely central in faith, it was bound to be asked, and very soon it was asked with growing insistence, whether this is compatible with the historical knowledge of His life which we actually possess. Had Ritschl's use of history not been a trifle violent and imperious ? Did not his exegesis too often savour of caprice ? For example, he had made the Kingdom of God, taken in a purely ethical sense, the basis of his theological system ; but what if the New Testament idea of the kingdom were really eschatological ? Again, his rigidly negative attitude to philosophy satisfied men less and less as time went on. Religion must come to terms somehow with reason, it was felt ; and to take a merely intransigent position was to court disaster. You cannot win men for

the Gospel by appealing to them not to use their minds. Once more, people began to say, after a time, that the Ritschlian love of system is a thing which the modern mind will simply not endure. It is a limitation in the master to be so severe, deductive, organic ; he is too complete, settled and rounded for the thought of to-day—far more complete, indeed, than experience itself. There ought to be room for the breadth, the fulness, the infinite variety of the religious experiences men do actually have, and for the numberless problems urged upon us by the complexity of life and knowledge. We can understand that it was the younger men, mainly, who felt and expressed these objections. They had not groaned under the burdens that Ritschl helped to lift from the shoulders of a former day. So they protested that he gave them little or no lead in meeting the problems of the new generation ; in particular they complained that he afforded no help to men confronted with the great modern idea of evolution which science takes, and must take, to embrace everything knowable, and which therefore has a *primâ facie* claim to reinterpret Christianity itself. Anyhow, we must cease to isolate our religion artificially. Its meaning is clearest when we set it full in the stream of universal religious history. The whole duty of a theologian is first to work himself, as a historical exegete, into the world of New Testament, or rather primitive Christian, ideas ; next to realize, as a serious thinker, that these ideas are long past and gone, and exercise no authority over the modern mind. But no one need be afraid of subjectivity. Man is religious by his very make ; and to say that without Christ we should be atheists is only a counsel of despair.

The movement whose antecedents I have sketched is worthy of close consideration, I think, for several reasons. For one thing, it shows how mistaken is the opinion some-

times expressed by otherwise well-instructed persons, that what we should call negative criticism played its last card in Strauss, Renan and the author of *Supernatural Religion*, was refuted duly by men like Tholuck and Lightfoot, and after that had no more that it could do. Nothing could well be more unlike the facts. Negative criticism is still with us, and will be with the Church to the end. It does not appear to be the will of God that it should ever cease. Only this summer a new work appeared, by a young Strassburg scholar,¹ in which he reviewed literature upon the Life of Jesus in the last century and a half ; and his independent conclusions are summed up under these three heads : (a) the supernatural is incredible ; (b) the Fourth Gospel is valueless as history ; (c)—and this is the point we should especially note—the gist of Jesus' teaching is eschatological delusion. Again, the movement I am discussing is propagandist in spirit, and, although the tide is already ebbing in Germany, its ideas are steadily making way here. And yet again, we are dealing with a conscious and excessively able attempt to render Christianity palatable to the modern mind, which proceeds by bringing our faith relentlessly under the rules of a general religious evolution. In a large measure, it endeavours to secure what is valuable in the Gospel by taking ideas from it and dissolving its historical facts.

Turning now to estimate the worth of these conceptions, we shall all concede that immense gains may accrue to theology from the psychological study of religion. For correcting the doctrinaire and impotent abstractions to which theology is so prone, no method is more natural or more unfailing. What are the hopes and fears and joys of the religious mind, or the mind that is trying to be religious, and how precisely these are removed or modified or perfected by faith in Jesus Christ, is a theological question of first-

¹ Schweizer, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*.

class importance, as every missionary and preacher is aware. Anything to save us from talking formulae in the pulpit! Anything to remind us of the manifold idiosyncrasies of the human soul, to make impossible a religion that lives only in books, to set us upon the task of discovering the precise aspect of the Gospel which means healing and salvation for a given mind. The more psychology the better, then; only it must be with two reservations touching the manner in which the modern school has combined it with the methods of historical science. First, in the study of religious mental phenomena it is their way to put what seems to me a seriously wrong emphasis upon the rudimentary and ecstatic, as well as upon experiences that are abnormal and exceptional; as though the more elementary, and, so to speak, childish, a pious feeling is the more characteristically Christian is its type. This comes out especially in some valuable recent investigations into the New Testament doctrine of the Spirit. To go down to the depths is thus identified or confused with going back to the beginning. Mystery is taken to be what specifically constitutes the religious frame or mood, and now and then the remark is added that in these deepest and most ineffable feelings all religions are really one. And so, the minds of these writers having come to be pre-occupied, almost imperceptibly, with phenomena of enthusiasm, awe, ecstasy, and tremulous excitement, such as occur in every religious society, they are apt to settle upon these as the essence of the matter, and in consequence to insist that walls which have been dogmatically raised between Christianity and other faiths shall straightway be thrown down. No supernatural interposition is required to account for the emotions we have been accustomed to regard as specifically Christian; they are all explicable by the known laws of psychological life, viewed as a self-contained and internally determined sphere, which needs and indeed tolerates no

such intrusions. The attitude is, in many respects, identical with that familiar to the English reader in Professor James of Harvard's captivating and vivacious book, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*.

Secondly, this method of religious psychology applied to history gives us not the slightest help in deciding questions of *truth* in the objective sense. Of course we know beforehand that every religion has its subjective aspect; it takes shape in emotions, ideas, beliefs which form a part of the mental life of its adherents; and in this respect Christianity is undeniably like its neighbours. Yet the most accurate psychological examination of these ideas and beliefs has so far no bearing whatsoever upon their real validity, nor on these lines do we get one step nearer to settling *that*. Not only so; you cannot tell, by purely historical methods, whether one religion is higher than another, or pronounce one stage in the religious development of a people an advance upon the preceding stage. For any such judgment some criterion of truth and value must be accessible. Now it has usually been held that the peculiarity—as logicians say, the *differentia*—of Christianity is that it presents not a subjective aspect merely of beliefs and hopes toward God, but also an objective reality corresponding to the faith of man, and in the last analysis creative of it. There *is* no Pantheon answering to the conception of the Greek; but the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ both is, and is a rewarder of those that seek Him. But if this be so, it is futile to talk as though Greek religion and Christianity were virtually on one level, and could be freely used to criticize or to confirm each other, all ideas of a revelation of grace being meanwhile put in abeyance. In short, this kind of psychological description has no interest in truth as such; it is concerned only with what happens, not at all with its meaning. Hence it would scarcely be too much to say that the method we

are discussing is, in its rigour, valueless for systematic theology, except upon terms that would be simply ruinous. Either it must stick uniformly to the principles of pure history, judging everything by analogy and correlativity, and then it has no point of contact with a Dogmatic which takes it as its province to vindicate the Christian view of things as *true* ; or it must introduce, irrelevantly, the particular personal convictions of the thinker, and it then becomes a question whether *they* are provable.

Perhaps the far-reaching changes of perspective which the Christian mind is thus called on to make are seen most clearly when we note that on the new theory we must surrender the claim of Christianity to be absolute. It is not merely that the definite lines of Christian doctrine that Ritschl drew so firmly are dissolved, and the supernatural character of the Gospel as a Divine Father's personal message to the sinner veiled in obscurity ; it is not merely that we are forbidden any longer to describe Christianity as the true faith, and other faiths as false. In a sense, this last might not disquiet us greatly, for Christianity is too majestic to live upon the depreciation of rivals. It is not for us to be narrower than St. Peter, when he said that " God is no respecter of persons : but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of Him." But it is to be observed that we are bidden to lay aside the doctrine that the Christian religion is perfect and absolute, even in the form in which that doctrine was asserted by idealistic philosophers of a past generation, like T. H. Green. We cannot and ought not to say that Christianity is absolutely true, for history is the domain of the relative only. We may stretch a point and concede that Christianity is the best religion which has yet appeared ; we may even allow that it would be practically difficult or impossible to conceive a better ; nevertheless, like the past,

the future may be rich in surprises. And after all, would an absolute religion do more for us than is done by the highest attainable? We may still rejoice in the truth that has been granted us; we may still believe that Christianity has a place all to itself in the plan of God. But in no case must we transgress the limits of historical knowledge.

The only answer to most of this is to say that Christianity stands or falls with the claim to be absolute. We do not judge it by other faiths, but all other faiths by it. "In Thy light do we see light." This is a conviction with which theology tampers only at the cost of sacrificing its own *raison d'être*; for in the last resort what theology exists to do is to make articulate the affirmations of faith. Take away the certainty that the Christian gospel is something by itself,—God Himself its centre, the love of God its very heart, the power of God flowing freely through its operations, and the egoistic taint that clings to every other religion purged out,—take away this certainty, and the roots of human faith in salvation are cut. The need of revelation, the gravity of sin, the infinite potentialities of personality: it is the one thing sure to the Christian mind that Jesus Christ deals adequately with them all. How long could we continue to believe in missions, or urge the missionary enterprise, except in the clear assurance that we are in a position to offer men what is better than the best they have, or dream of having? Surely the truth is rather with the writer who pleads that God's providential action may be seen in the fact that the vast increase in missionary enthusiasm witnessed by our generation is exactly contemporaneous with an unprecedented advance in the science of Comparative Religion; as though to persuade men who otherwise might doubt it of the absolute position of the faith of Christ amid human beliefs. In short, those who ask us to give up the absolute character of the Gospel fail to realize what their proposal signifies for practical religion.

But of course the denial of the absolute nature of Christianity rests ultimately on a denial of the absolute nature of Christ Himself. Accordingly we find that the category under which the modern school brings Him is that of the religious genius or hero or prophet. It is a conception which was first acclimatized in theology by Strauss, and fostered by Carlyle's *Heroes and Hero-worship*; and that it has its uses it would be foolish to deny. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews employed it when he described our Lord as the Author and Finisher of faith, although he did not stop there. What we are bound to note, however, is that it is a category which includes others beside Jesus, and therefore is condemned before the Christian mind as a full or adequate interpretation of His person. It shuts out blankly everything in Jesus that is unique and incomparable, and offers no reason at all why we should join with the New Testament in naming Him Lord and Redeemer. Furthermore, to scholars like Wrede or Bousset practically every fibre in the New Testament conception of Christ can be accounted for historically, and labelled with its theological pedigree. There was a vague Messianic idea in the world, the argument runs; there was a kind of redemption-myth current in pious minds scattered over the Roman Empire in a hundred varied forms, and these impalpable, yearning dreams of salvation were deposited, like crystals in a super-saturated solution, on the idealized name of Jesus of Nazareth. It came to be believed that He had done and suffered all things expected of the Christ. You can explain what was thought of Him from the fermenting ideas of the time; Eastern Gnosticism and syncretistic Judaism will virtually cover the whole field. The conception of a divine Saviour who came down from heaven and returned thither is one whose intellectual antecedents we know exactly, and nothing could have been more natural than

its appropriation by adoring believers, eager to deck the object of their faith with all possible names of honour. In a word, any one can see that here we have, risen from a state of suspended animation, the old distinction between the principle of redemption and the Person of the Redeemer, which used to be familiar in the idealistic theologies of last mid-century, and has come up again rather unexpectedly in quite new surroundings.

Now at this point a careful line must be drawn between that which Christian faith is bound to deny and the new historical knowledge it will be wiser to accept. For example, it is supremely credible that the minds of the Gentile world had been providentially prepared for some of the sublimest ideas of the New Testament. Thus the pre-existence of Christ had a way made for it, however roughly and imperfectly, into the Greek intelligence, by the mythical idea of gods who assumed human form. Again, it is an ascertained fact that on Greek soil there existed rudimentary forms of a conception which ultimately took perfect shape in the believing mind as identification with Christ ; for, as Professor Menzies has pointed out, "the Greek world knew at this time many a cult in which the deity was held to take possession of his worshippers, and to urge them by an inner impulse to all that his service required. If Greek religion was poor in moral guidance, it was strong on the side of sympathetic inspiration."¹ These things, I repeat, are ascertained facts, and it is surely no hard matter to find a place for them under the great apostolic thought that the Father sent forth His Son in the fulness of the times, when in language, in ideas, in civilized social order, in moral aspiration and in moral failure, the world lay ready for Him, and was stretching forth empty and pathetic hands. But it is another thing to say that this explains the New Testa-

¹ *St. Paul's View of the Divinity of Christ*, p. 30.

ment view of Christ. In point of fact it does so no more than the compositor's case of type explains the poem, or the quarryman's block explains the statue. These forms of art require the creative touch of poet and sculptor, and, equally, the apostolic faith in Jesus required the touch of His creative personality. Why, indeed, should they have fixed upon this Jesus, and said such things of Him as that in Him both heaven and earth consist and have their being, or that in Him all the fulness of the Godhead dwells, except it be that He had made upon them such an impression that no less or lower words would serve? They had eaten and drunken with Him and seen Him die; His weakness and mortality had not been concealed from them; yet they named Him the Lord, the image of the invisible God, the First and the Last, and did so not after a long, dark, suspicious interval which made anything possible, but from the days of the primitive Christian society. It is surely a question of sufficient gravity how you are to account for the supernatural impression made by Jesus on His contemporaries, if not on the hypothesis that there was something in Him capable of producing it. Certainly if we take Him to be only one more inhabitant of Palestine, resembling His neighbours far more than He differed from them, searching for God as some of them were doing with all the pathetic apparatus of human inquiry, it will not be hard to read the evangelic record of His life as a tissue of improbabilities, to say no more. It will then be easy to conceive His mind as simply "entangled in Judaism," not the master of apocalyptic ideas, but their slave. It will be easy to agree with Wellhausen that Jesus never said, never could have said, that He came to give His life a ransom for many, never bade men take up their cross and follow Him. On the other hand, to put aside the enormous initial difficulty of this theory that the believing view of Jesus is even older

than St. Paul, since it occupied the field immediately after the Resurrection, one can only say that this is one more hypothesis which has been made for the Christian mind, not by it. It is at variance with the one certainty on which faith reposes, which all testimony supports, and which all serious Christian thought assumes, that Jesus is not one of a class, or even the first among His peers, but that which none else can ever be, the truth and power of God for our salvation.¹

But the work of the modern school is, as I have hinted, more rewarding in the field of exegesis, and there its insight has been largely to the profit of New Testament study. Thus it lays an explanatory finger upon such things as baptism for the dead in First Corinthians, the cases of death and sickness which St. Paul construes as penalty for unworthy participation in the Lord's Supper, and, as Professor Kennedy of Toronto has shown us, upon a variety of features in the Pauline eschatology. So far as it goes there is real light in Dieterich's observation that "every Greek understood that Paul meant adoption by God as the form of reception into sonship, just as in the Greek cults even before him the rite of adoption was used as the means of reception into the mystic fellowship with the Deity." By such an explanation we are enabled in a sense to watch the apostolic mind at work among its materials, be they inherited or new-born of Christian faith. The new method has also compelled theologians to re-examine the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit. It may even help us slightly with the great Kenosis passage in Philippians ii., and freshen for us St. Paul's usage of the phrase "in Jesus' name." But it makes the common mistake of a young movement, the mistake of exaggeration. In particular it goes so far as

¹ Cf. Prof. Denney, in the *United Free Church Magazine* for Jan. 1906, p. 38.

practically to identify the form of a Biblical idea with its substance. Thus one writer proves that the formula "the breadth and length and depth and height" is to be found in an Egyptian religious incantation, where it denotes a vast flaming space in which the Deity becomes visible and takes up His dwelling; but why this should diminish the force of the same words in *Ephesians*, where St. Paul is speaking of Christ taking up His dwelling in the believing heart by faith, it is not easy to understand. We must not be imposed upon by what is only a specious verbal coincidence. Again, one scholar who has investigated the phrase "in Jesus' name" absurdly underestimates the originality of the Christian usage by pressing the analogy of other worships in which the name of the deity is uttered as a kind of charm. One may utter the name of Jesus, surely, in a variety of ways; by way of a charm, no doubt, if one is superstitious, but also merely because one is thinking of Him, or because one is confessing Him, or because one is praying to Him for help. In short, there is a difference between magic and religion, even when they use the same language. The line taken by the modern school does seem to have a direct bearing, indeed, upon many survivals of old polytheisms which flourish in at least the popular religion of the Roman Church, whose "worship of saints differs from that of the old gods only in a change of name and a partial change of the legends connected with them."¹ Even there, however, the pagan infection is not preponderant, and in the New Testament it simply does not exist. As has been pointed out, you can only speak of syncretism where the elements of different religions are admitted *on equal terms*; and the person who says that in the New Testament elements of Judaism or Hellenism rank as equally important for the Christian consciousness with the truth

¹ Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God*, vol. ii.

as it is in Jesus would, I believe, say anything. That apostolic writers got something, perhaps not a little, of the raw materials of their symbols, metaphors, apocalyptic pictures, from the circles of thought in which they moved, who would care to deny? All ideas have a history; they grow, as the idea of God has grown, from very humble origins; and no one can be surprised to learn that ages before Christ men had been using the words or conceptions atonement, salvation, glory, sin, life, Redeemer. It matters nothing where a Scripture writer got his words, or what their previous atmosphere had been; what does matter is the new meaning he poured into them, and the creative power with which he sent them forth minted afresh in the name of Jesus Christ. But the exegete is certain to go wrong who aims at identifying a New Testament idea with its verbal expression; this is to force upon Biblical authors a realism they would have firmly repudiated, and illegitimately to transform what, at most, are but free and natural analogies to the ideas of other religions, into cases of indirect dependence, or even direct borrowing.

Nowhere does this come out more clearly than in what the modern school have to say respecting the New Testament doctrine of the sacraments. As to the Eucharist, for example, it is held that St. Paul's representation can best be interpreted in the light of the religious realism or materialism of the time. Ideas common to ancient Semitic worships and the mysteries of Mithras are here—ideas of participation in the substance of the Godhead through blood-fellowship, through a sacramental eating of Deity. On these lines recent inquirers have declared that Baptism and the Lord's Supper in St. Paul are religious actions which are effective simply as actions; as belonging, that is, to the realistic and mystical side of experience in contradistinction to what is ethical and personal. Misinterpreting the

simple original meaning of Jesus, we are told, the Apostle fell back into the old, ethnic notions of communion with God in physical or quasi-physical ways, rather than through the conscious and ethically mediated act of faith. The minds of all religious men in that age were filled with such ideas, and St. Paul shared them with the rest. I do not know whether High Churchmen will accept this new and unexpected argument in support of their contention that the realistic view of the sacrament is the apostolic view; but for evangelical theology at least the right course is clear. Quite apart from the interesting point as to whether, as good Protestants, to whom Scripture is a guide, not an external law, we should be in duty bound to become ritualists if it were proved that St. Paul is one—quite apart from this, I say, we should have to inquire how any such view could be harmonized with the supreme principle of the apostle's doctrine of salvation, viz., the absolute sufficiency of simple faith in Christ. Until such a harmony has even begun to be proved, remoter problems need not perturb our minds.

To conclude, it is impossible to deny that the writers I have been discussing have much to impart to us, and that we shall fail to get beyond them if we refuse the new truth they bring. Obviously, a movement like this cannot be warded off by any *ipse dixit* of the Church. The novelty of it breaks in upon the settled peace of theological inertia, to urge us forward, to stir our thoughts, to recall the truth—never far from the minds of serious men—that God fulfils Himself in many ways. Hence, though we may not concede to Wernle that the function of theology is finally to deliver the Church from theologians, as functionaries whose very existence is incompatible with the native freedom of the Gospel; yet we have no difficulty in conceding that one of its tasks is to rid the Church of theologies which are visibly

past their best. Nor ought we to forget that these writers are men of profoundly religious feeling, or that to be really religious to-day is to take up one's cross. I believe that their works help to show us how, in Dr. Sanday's words, we may learn "by degrees to think of Christianity, not as something entirely isolated in the world, but as the climax and crown of other religions." Thirty years ago it was customary to assume that hundreds of words in the Greek New Testament were exclusively and technically Christian, whereas to-day we know through papyri and inscriptions that they are really normal first-century spoken Greek; and perhaps in this fact the wise may see a parable. It is all for the best that free airs should blow, from time to time, across the fields of exegesis. Fresh study of religious psychology cannot but stimulate Christian life, and enrich alike its practice and its theory. Deepened interest in great religious personalities, whether in the Bible or out of it, is pure gain. Everything is welcome that quickens the consciousness that religion, wherever it has seized and moulded human beings, is a thing that lives and moves. And we may well rejoice to learn how other faiths dimly anticipated, as if in dreams, vast and sublime truths which were destined to break clearly upon the waking consciousness of those who dwelt in the light of Christ. All this enables us to take a wider retrospect of the ways of God with men, aware as we still remain that it is only the pure, lucid melody of the Gospel itself that has trained our ear to catch its faint, premonitory echo in the worships of the Gentiles.

Nevertheless, it must be said frankly that the terms which these writers demand, especially in regard to the Person of our Lord, are impossible for all who desire to keep the faith once delivered to the saints. In many ways, as they shuffle and reshuffle old material, they are strangely re-

miniscent of the eighteenth century, although doubtless there is in their view of things a romantic strain, as well as a living sense of history, to which that urbane and temperate period had not attained. Perhaps, however, the feature of their theology on which they chiefly pride themselves—its modernity—may prove in the end its undoing; for one has an instinctive feeling that a Christianity reduced to accord with the ideals of Goethe, Carlyle and Bismarck is neither the Gospel that sinners need nor that God in His great mercy has given. A theology of impressionism, for so we may describe their view, is essentially a short-lived theology, and in this case the fate cannot be said to be wholly undeserved. Hence, despite a real desire to be sympathetic, I cannot but conclude by subscribing to Hermann's recent words of grave and measured disapprobation: "Its representatives," he writes regarding the movement I have examined, "its representatives are great as experts in sympathy with the piety of other minds, but the will to have a piety of their own rises with them but seldom to full consciousness. They can show us how the prophets heard the word of God, and how the soul of an apostle is filled with conflict and with peace. They can brush the dust of centuries from the words of Jesus; they can even depict with lofty enthusiasm Jesus' incomparable soul. But there is seldom a token that they have really considered what it means for them, as men, that this victorious Person appeals to them, in such vivid fulness, from the page of Scripture. Had they considered it, they would at least keep silence when others give honour, as Lord, to the Christ who alone has subdued their heart. So long as they lack understanding here they are useless for the work Christian Theology has to do for to-day." ¹

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

¹ *Kultur d. Gegenwart* (1906), Teil i., Abth. iv., p. 629.

THE MARTYR APOSTLES.

THE Gospel writers know of but three among the Twelve who suffered martyrdom, and even tradition, which busied itself in developing the later career of each apostle, long hesitated to award the martyr's crown to any save Peter and James and John. The last-named held a curiously vacillating position of both martyr and surviving "witness (*μάρτυς*) of Messiah." He drank the cup of Jesus (according to legend a cup of poison) and was baptized with his baptism of death (according to legend immersion in boiling oil), but emerged from the ordeal unharmed, to continue untouched of corruption in a sleep that only resembled death until the coming of the Lord. The legend is due to the harmonistic interweaving in later fancy of two antithetic prophecies of Jesus, one to the disciples at the Declaration of Messiah's Fate, "Some that stand by shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom";¹ the other to James and John, as they ask the pre-eminent places in the Messianic kingdom, "Ye shall indeed drink of my cup, but to sit at my right and left hand is reserved for them that are worthy." Peter is the third, who offers to go with Jesus to prison and death; but breaks down in the attempt.

Regarding the actual fate of these apostolic volunteers

¹ Matt. xvi. 28=Mark ix. 1=Luke ix. 27. As an actual promise of Jesus the passage is not only supported by this strong array but by the kindred saying Matt. xxiv. 34=Mark xiii. 30=Luke xxi. 32, and by the conviction of the whole primitive Church, attested by Paul in numerous well-known passages, that the second advent was to come "quickly," while some of them "were alive and remained." The unique phrase "taste of death" is an indication that Jesus has in mind the expected "witnesses of Messiah," Moses (or Enoch) and Elias, who in Jewish apocalypse (2 Esdr. vi. 26) attend the coming of Messiah as "the men that were taken up, that have not *tasted death* from their birth." The meaning seems to be repeated in the Lucan assurance (Acts i. 8), "*Ye are my witnesses.*"

to martyrdom only one is reported in positive, distinct terms by any New Testament writer. In Acts xii. 1 f. Luke informs us of the decapitation of James by Agrippa I early in the year 44 A.D. As to Peter's fate, while the tradition is early, and apparently trustworthy, that he perished at Rome by crucifixion in the Neronian persecution of 64 A.D., the only New Testament references to it are in the veiled language of symbolism. The appendix to the Fourth Gospel, balancing the respective claims of the apostle to whom leadership over the flock of Christ is committed, and the "other disciple" whose task it is to "witness" until He come, shows already the traces of the harmonization of the two antithetic prophecies already referred to, in application to John. Peter, who had been told when first he volunteered to lay down his life for Jesus, "Thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow afterwards" (John xiii. 36), is told now, "When thou wast young thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt *stretch forth thy hands*, and another shall gird thee,¹ and carry thee whither thou wouldest not." The author adds that Jesus "spake this signifying by what manner of death Peter should glorify God," and then significantly adds that "when Jesus had spoken this He saith unto him, Follow me."

This account leaves little doubt in the mind of the reader accustomed to the symbolism of the Fourth Gospel, that an allusion is intended to the time, and even the manner, in which Peter's too self-confident offer, "Lord, why cannot I follow Thee even now? I will lay down my life for Thee" was to find at last its worthy fulfilment.

¹ In the Orient old men are girded by standing up, stretching out the hands and revolving the body, thus winding around the waist the long sash or girdle, whereof one end is held by an attendant. Young men gird themselves.

But while the symbolic veil is less transparent, there is one other Gospel fragment which seems to the present writer scarcely less certainly concerned with the same over-confident offer of Peter to "follow," redeemed, after a first humiliating failure, by an ultimately victorious faith. It forms an appendix in Matthew xiv. 28-32 to the Markan story of Jesus' Walking on the Sea. This narrative itself is suggestive of symbolism, from its connexion with the Feeding of the Multitude, wherein the Fourth Evangelist rightly finds a type of the Agape with its memorializing (in the appended eucharist) of the Lord's death (John vi. 52-58). Jesus by His death had been separated from the disciples, leaving them to battle alone against the elements of the world, yet left them not alone, but triumphing over all the waves and billows of death which had gone over Him, came to them, cheered them and piloted their craft to its desired haven. For those to whom triumph over the sea-monster was a favourite symbol for Jesus' victory over the power of death and the under-world,¹ and His rebuke of the storm which threatened the boat-load of disciples on Gennesaret one of the proofs of His Messianic power, such a combination in the symbolism of sacramental teaching is not difficult to conceive.²

Whether or not this be the case with Mark vi. 45-52, which the Evangelist declares to have been a sign misunderstood at the time by the disciples because "their heart was hardened," Matthew's addition to the story is highly suggestive of symbolic intent. When Peter saw Jesus treading the billows under foot he entreated:

"Lord, if it be Thou, bid me come unto Thee upon the waters. . . . But when he saw the wind he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried out, saying, Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus

¹ Cf. Matt. xii. 40, and *Jona*, H Schmidt, 1907.

² For an instance of the kind very fully elaborated see the *Epistle of Clement to James* xiv.

stretched forth His hand and took hold of him, and saith unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt ?”

We have little difficulty in recognizing in the legend of Domine, quo vadis ? a variation on this same theme of Peter's denial and recovery. It is certainly conceivable that this representation of Peter's ultimately successful attempt to share in Jesus' triumph over the powers of the under-world should have been suggested by the fate by which Peter at last redeemed his promise to “follow unto prison and death.”

To the practically certain allusion in John xiii. 36-38, xxi. 18 f. we may, therefore, join Matthew xiv. 28-32 as a possible second allusion within the limits of the Gospels, though only in their latest elements, to the martyrdom of Peter. It remains to be seen whether further traces may not be discoverable of other apostolic martyrdoms.

§ An increasing number of critics, beginning with the independent conclusions of Bousset and Wellhausen, are convinced that the “prophecy” to the two sons of Zebedee, “Ye shall indeed drink of my cup,” could not have obtained its place in Mark x. 39=Matthew xx. 23, and then maintained it unaltered until the stereotyping of the tradition, unless the prophecy had actually met fulfilment. These critics are therefore, disposed to accept as genuine and historical the fragment of Papias recently published by de Boor¹ in which this writer of about 150 A.D. declares that “John and James his brother were killed by the Jews,” to which an interpolator of the Codex Coislinianus adds, “thus fulfilling the prophecy of Jesus concerning them.” Zahn² vainly endeavours to show why it is impossible that Papias—who undoubtedly regarded the Apostle John

¹ *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, v. 2, p. 170.

² *Forschungen*, vi. p. 147 ff.

as in some sense responsible for the Apocalypse¹—should have endorsed this tradition. No reason exists why Papias may not have referred this somewhat indefinite literary activity of the apostle—or, for that matter the authorship of the whole “Johannine” canon—to a period antecedent to this martyrdom. The *Muratorianum*, if it does not actually rest upon Papias, is at least as open to all these objections of incompatibility with the later tradition of John’s survival to the times of Trajan, as Papias could be. And the *Muratorianum* represents John’s authorship of Revelation as antecedent to the Pauline Epistles! As for the argument that later readers of Papias could not then have accepted the tradition of the aged survivor of the apostolic band, it is enough to observe that the two writers who actually do quote the statement of Papias are able to reconcile it with the accepted belief, and that those who could not (such as Eusebius) have simply ignored it, doubtless classing it with the *μυθικώτερα* which Eusebius claims to find in his pages.

Until some valid reason is advanced, therefore, why this doubly attested statement of the martyrdom of James and John may not have stood on the [pages of Papias, writing *circa* 150, it must be accepted as the simple historical fact, in perfect harmony with the “prophecy” it was adduced to confirm. What must be explained is its displacement by the subsequently dominant tradition of the survival of John, the earliest attestation of this tradition being found again in the appendix to the Fourth Gospel (John xxi. 23).

But it is not the whole truth to say that a tradition identifying the surviving “witness of Messiah” of Mark ix. 1 with John the son of Zebedee is attested by the apologetic

¹ Fragments x. and xi. in *The Apostolic Fathers*, Lightfoot-Harmer, 1891.

of John xxi. 23. The author does indeed unde-
 vindicate for "the disciple whom Jesus loved" ^{3rd} to
 martyrdom" in contrast to the "red martyrdom" white
 He goes further. He undertakes a vindication of Peter.
 of the tradition *against* the objection that the wi³ form
 died—or at least might be expected to die. N^{ss} had
 that the word of Jesus had been conditionally s¹ merely
 also that the disciple's "witness" does in fac^{en}, but
 in the same way as the witness of Moses and t¹ continue
 appealed to in v. 39. "This is the disciple t¹ prophets
 witness to these things (ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων beareth
 these things." The paragraph, therefore, shound wrote
 after verse 24, not after verse 23. This is be closed
 truth concerning this author's dealing with t¹ of the
 of the μαρτυρία of John. The other part, v³ tradition
 ignored in current discussions of the appen^d fortunately
 also deals (in the lightest touch of symbolis¹ is that it
 but no less surely) with the other form of t¹ to be sure,
John a sharer of Jesus' cup of martyrdom. e tradition:
 does not lightly use the term "follow" in t¹ The author
 All possible literary art is used in verse 19^{is} connexion.
 pregnancy of meaning. If, therefore, he to indicate its
 ately after (v. 20) that "Peter, turning e¹lls us immedi-
 disciple whom Jesus loved following," an^{out}, seeth the
 asked the question when he saw John "then that Peter
 then John's fate would be (κύριε, οὗτ¹ following," what
 ambiguity of the answer which Jesus retur^{δὲ τί;});¹ the
 designed to cover both forms of the tradit¹ is deliberately
 intends to meet the conter^{er v} of both part¹n. The writer
 John's μαρτυρία was to t¹ e Cc¹ "following" is. Some think
 in which Peter finally^y of f¹lowed" Jesus¹ the same sense
 Others think

¹ The rendering "Will our¹ t¹c this man do?" d
 sense. The meaning is, B¹oubted¹ manner of death sha¹es not convey the
 οὗτος) glorify God? this man (emphatic

it was to be that of the survivor of "those that stood by" when Jesus declared that that generation should not pass till the judgment came, a tarrying "without tasting of death" until the Lord come, in the sense of "the witnesses of Messiah" of 2 Esdras vi. 26.¹ A "tarrying" or a "following" witness—which did Jesus predict for John? The Evangelist's answer to this question is: It cannot be known whether Jesus predicted one fate or the other for John. One thing is important. As Peter was given the function of administrative care (as moderns might say, the ruling eldership) John was given that of interpretation of the truth (the teaching eldership). Whatever the form of his visible *μαρτυρία*, whether by life or by death, his enduring "witness" to the Lord is that he "is a witness of these things and wrote these things." The pertinence of the appendix as a commendation of the evangelic writing which it accompanies resides, accordingly, in this paragraph John xxi. 15-24² treated as a whole. The writer takes account of *both* forms of the earlier tradition of the *μαρτυρία* of John, and substitutes for them his own, along with the book whose "truth" he guarantees. His interpretation is this: The *μαρτυρία* of John is rather the tarrying than the following witness, but not in the sense of *physical* survival. His *testimony* abides.

It is doubtful if the New Testament contains other allusions to the *μαρτυρία* of James and John, yet before we confront the problem why the tradition interpreting it in John's

¹ Whosoever remaineth . . . shall see my salvation and the end of my world. And they shall behold the men that have been taken up (Moses—according to other authorities Enoch—and Elijah), who have not tasted death from their birth."

On the current apocalyptic conception of the "witnesses of Messiah" the "sons of oil" that "stand in the presence of the Lord of the whole earth" as His "remembrancers" of the need of Zion, see Bousset, *Legend of Antichrist*, the chapter on this subject, and Rev. xi. 3-13.

² Verse 25 is not found in *N**, and may well be a later addition. Tischendorf's text rejects it.

f M.
ttes.
lic F

case in the sense of the tarrying witness (Mark ix. 1) should have ultimately superseded that which interpreted it in the sense of the following witness (Mark x. 39), we must take into account two more possible traces. The former may be dismissed briefly, since its value is wholly dependent on our judgment regarding the difficult question of the composite structure of Revelation.

(1) In substantially its present form the Apocalypse of John is a product of "the end of the reign of Domitian," as even Irenaeus was already aware. It seems to have included the portions which claim Johannine authorship at least from before 155 A.D., when Justin already quotes it as the work of this apostle. Whether the imputation to John is older than the introductions and epilogues which seem to have been added "in the end of the reign of Domitian" would be difficult to say. For, as practically all recent critics admit, an older element borrowed from Jewish apocalypse has been incorporated at least in the section dealing with the two "witnesses of Messiah" in xi. 1-13. That these "witnesses" were originally Moses and Elias is quite apparent from the description of their miraculous endowments in verse 6.¹ Their prophecy follows upon the voice of the seven thunders (Rev. x.) which the seer is forbidden to write and commanded to "seal up." In a measure it takes the place of these thunders, the witnesses themselves having both of them the Elijan weapon of fire from heaven, so that "if any man shall desire to hurt them fire proceedeth out of their mouth and devoureth their enemies." Nevertheless, "when they shall have finished their testimony" the beast from the abyss puts them to

¹ "These have the power to shut the heaven that it rain not during the days of their prophecy (Elias); and they have power over the waters to turn them into blood, and to smite the earth with every plague, as often as they shall desire" (Moses).

death. This, too, as we learn from Mark ix. 13, is a genuine element of the old apocalyptic legend of Elias. A vivid trait is the fact that their dead bodies are suffered to lie exposed "in the street of the great city." Finally, after the symbolic period of the half of seven days,

The breath of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet, and great fear fell upon them which beheld them. And they heard a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither. And they went up into heaven in the cloud, after the likeness of the ascension of Jesus.

The occidental reader would probably have some difficulty in guessing that "the great city" in whose streets the bodies of the two witnesses lie unburied is Jerusalem (!), were it not for the friendly editorial hand which inserts the explanation "that which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where their Lord also was crucified." But whom does the incorporator of this bit of apocalypse mean by "the two witnesses"? For it is somewhat difficult to imagine him, as a Christian, thinking of Moses' and Elias' return otherwise than in some Christian embodiment, as John the Baptist in the Synoptic writers is treated as a reincarnation of Elias. Especially difficult is it when their martyrdom is brought into express relation with that of Jesus as "their Lord" (!), and their resurrection and ascension are depicted in obvious relation to that of Jesus.

If the question were asked of Justin Martyr, we could answer it at once. The "witness of Messiah," who comes again in the guise of Elias to effect the "great repentance" before the great and terrible day of the Lord (cf. Rev. xi. 13) is John the Baptist redivivus:—

Shall we not suppose that the word of God has proclaimed that Elijah shall be the precursor of the great and terrible day, that is, of his (Jesus') second advent? "Certainly," he (Trypho the Jew) answered. "Well, then, our Lord in his teaching," I continued, "proclaimed that this very thing would take place," saying that Elijah would also come. And we know that this shall take

place when our Lord Jesus Christ shall come in glory from heaven ; whose first manifestation the Spirit of God which was in Elijah preceded as herald in the person of John, a prophet among your nation.”¹

But the Apocalyptist has not yet with Justin reduced the “two witnesses” to one ; and he gives no indication that he has in mind the Baptist. On the contrary he seems to be thinking of two martyrs of Jesus, whose fate provokes the bitterest resentment in his mind against “the great city which spiritually is called Sodom, and Egypt, where their Lord too was crucified.” For the stereotyped apocalyptic feature of the “great repentance” almost disappears from view in his elaboration of the vengeance inflicted on the guilty city through the earthquake, wherein a tenth part of the city is destroyed and seven thousand persons are killed (*v.* 13 ; cf. the earthquake of Matt. xxvii. 51–53). Where hot indignation flames out as here there must be something more than scholastic borrowing of dead material.

The pages of the Synoptic Gospels, which reflect the popular apocalyptic conceptions of the coming of Elias as witness of Messiah, as martyr, as raised from the dead, and perhaps (in Christian form) as avenger of Messiah’s wrongs, are those to which we must look for light on the question what personalities, if any, the incorporator of Revelation xi. 1–13 has in mind. In Matthew and Mark, John the Baptist appears as Elias, who anoints the Messiah and makes him known to himself and the people.² The idea that his martyrdom was in fulfilment of (apocryphal) prophecy is admitted,³ and we have traces of its companion elements,⁴

¹ See the instructive context in *Dial.* xlix.

² For the Jewish tradition on this point see Justin Martyr, *Dial.* viii. and xlix.

³ Mark ix. 13. The only other trace of this in pre-Christian legend is in the Slavonic *Book of Biblical Antiquities* attributed to Philo, where Elias redivivus in the person of Phineas is put to death by the tyrant.

⁴ The apocalyptic developments of the doctrine of the “witnesses”

the miracles which are supposed to "work in him" *because* he is risen from the dead (Mark vi. 14), and his coming again before the end (xv. 35 f.). But the last two conceptions are only alluded to, not admitted by, the Evangelist. The Baptist's function is complete, in Mark's idea, at his death. On the other hand Moses and Elias are certainly introduced as witnesses of Messiah in the remarkable scene of the Transfiguration; only their function is obscure. It is not clear whether their appearance in "the vision" witnessed by the three disciples is prophetic of the glory that is to be by-and-by, or whether it is an uncovering to their minds of the present hidden reality. Perhaps both.

In Luke the crudity of the Markan apocalyptic ideas is much modified. The Baptist was from his birth a forerunner "in the spirit and power of Elijah" (i. 17, 76-79; vii. 27), but the direct identification with Elias (Matt. xi. 14), the statement that "scripture" had been fulfilled in his martyrdom, and the cry from the cross, are omitted. The allusions to popular expectations of the resurrection of Elias and his mighty works are also almost completely suppressed. "Moses and Elias" still appear in the Transfiguration *to predict the crucifixion* (ix. 31; cf. xxiv. 25-27); but instead of coming again from the dead to effect the great repentance, Israel is forewarned in a special appendix to the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (xvi. 26-31) that if they do not accept the *written* witness of Moses and the prophets the return from the dead would be useless.

How radically the Fourth Gospel treats the identification

are fond of introducing the trait of the duel of wonders in which the true witness(es) withstand and outdo the wonders of the false prophet(s) in the presence of the tyrant; as Moses and Aaron withstood Jannes and Jambres in the presence of Pharaoh. The great repentance ensues upon the final victory of the witnesses in raising the dead. Cf. Bousset, *Legend of Antichrist* and the Clementine duel of Peter (and Paul) against Simon Magus.

of the Baptist with Elias, his witness and his mighty works (John i. 19–28, x. 41) need here only be mentioned. To this Evangelist as well as to Luke it is only in their writings that Moses and Elias are the witnesses of Messiah (John v. 33–47).¹

But in the deep-lying material incorporated by both Mark and Luke there are certain suggestions which cannot well be overlooked when the question is put, Whom, if any one, had the apocalypticist in mind when he incorporated the paragraph on the martyred “witnesses”?

Aside from the prophecy to the sons of Zebedee, “Ye shall indeed drink my cup,” significantly omitted by Luke (!), the Synoptic Gospels contain but two references to the brothers James and John taken by themselves. The first is Mark iii. 17, where we learn that they bore *together* the Aramaic surname Boanerges. What the real meaning of the epithet may have been is obscure; even the meaning Mark attached to it is almost equally obscure, for while the words “sons of thunder” by which he renders the surname are plain enough, no feature of the life or character of the brothers is given to show in what sense the epithet was meant.

The only other New Testament passage where the pair are mentioned by themselves is Luke ix. 51–56; and here the textual variants, even if unauthentic, are of sufficient interpretative value to be worthy of incorporation (in []) with the text:

And it came to pass when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, and sent messengers before his face; and they went and entered into a village of the Samaritans to make ready for him. And they did not receive him because his face was (set as) going to Jerusalem. And when his disciples *James and John* saw (this), they said, Lord,

¹ The Baptist, however, was “the lamp” (ὁ λύχνος, John v. 35; cf. αἱ δύο λυχνίαι, Rev. xi. 4) granted as a concession to human weakness

wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven and consume them [as Elijah did]? But he turned and rebuked them and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. [For the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives but to save them]¹. And they went to another village.

To the Evangelist at least the spirit rebuked is not so much that of the historical Elijah, which it would not have occurred to any of our Gospel writers to question ; but (unless we greatly err) he sees rebuked in it the vindictive spirit of Revelation xi. 1-13, a spirit which rejoices in the fire proceeding out of the mouth of the two witnesses and devouring their enemies "as Elijah did" (2 Kings i. 12), a spirit only too glad that "if any man desireth to hurt them, in this manner must he be killed." But if the narrative have really this aim in view, we have here a clue to the long-vexed problem of the epithet "Sons of Thunder." It was applied to James and John not so much for what they had done, as for what *they were expected to do*. Revelation xi. 1-13, with its lurid substitute for the unuttered "voice of the seven thunders," is a cry from the tortured spirit of the church, driven out in A.D. 64-67 from "the city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt," after its chief "pillars" James the Just (and may we now conjecturally add, John the son of Zebedee?) had been stoned and beaten to death in its streets, "where their Lord too was crucified." Under the ancient apocalyptic figure the vision depicts the work of vengeance which is to be wrought by the *μάρτυρες* of Messiah in the day when He comes to judgment against the guilty city. As in Justin John the Baptist-Elias renews his work of preparing the way of the Lord at the second advent, so here the Sons of Thunder come before Him to judgment, with fire to destroy their enemies. A great earthquake destroys a tenth part of the blood-

¹ The clause in double [] is found in still fewer authorities than that which precedes it.

stained city, and seven thousand perish of those that had made merry over the dead bodies of the prophets.¹

But in our Gospels another spirit has displaced the vindictive spirit of the earlier parts of Revelation. The cry from the cross is no longer an appeal to Elias to come and take Him down, but a wail over the departing presence of God. The last remnant of the spirit of Revelation xi. 1-13, if the title "sons of thunder" be really such, remains a meaningless survival in Mark. Thereafter it disappears. And in its place comes in the Lucan story of the rebuke to James and John, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."²

(2) One more trace seems to us to be distinguishable in the Synoptic Gospels of the period when James and John, together with Peter, Rome's "following" witness ("carried away whither he would not"), were the three martyr-apostles. Like the two sons of Zebedee, the trio, "Peter and James and John" are mentioned in but three fundamental passages by our Second Evangelist, from whose pages the group has generally been transferred intact to those of Matthew and Luke.³ Mark represents Jesus in these three instances as admitting only "Peter and James

¹ Cf. the cry of the souls of the martyrs from under the altar, Rev. vi. 9 f., "How long, O Master, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood?" and its answer.

² If the *argumentum e silentio* is not to be excluded, we should take also into account the strange phenomenon that the Fourth Evangelist, who treats Synoptic eschatology so radically, in particular the doctrine of the coming of Elias, has stricken from his pages all mention whatever of either of the sons of Zebedee! In their place comes in the new and mysterious figure of "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

³ Matthew disregards the selection of the three in the story of the raising of Jairus' daughter. Luke, after introducing the group in the Markan form at the beginning of the Transfiguration story, refers to them in the addition which he makes (Luke ix. 32) only as "Peter and they that were with him" (cf. xiii. 45). Hence the trio appears to be of primary significance to Mark only.

and John ” to a peculiarly intimate relationship with Himself. Not even Andrew, who forms one of the group of four at the calling of the first followers (Mark i. 16–20), and the prediction of the doom of Jerusalem (Mark xiii. 3) is here admitted.

It is conceivable that the phenomenon might have its explanation in the subsequent importance to the Jerusalem church of “James and Cephas and John, those who were regarded as pillars ” (Gal. ii. 9) anachronistically referred to the earlier time. To the present writer this explanation would seem more probable than the current one of some special predilection of Jesus for just these three. But one difficulty—perhaps not insuperable¹—is the fact that the James who became the “pillar ” is not the same as the intimate of the Gospel of Mark. A more serious objection to this theory is that it leaves unexplained the special nature of the three occasions in which only the trio are admitted. It cannot be mere accident that all are connected with the same supremely important theme: “Christ and the power of His resurrection.” The three occasions are the Raising of Jairus’ Daughter, the Transfiguration, and the Agony in Gethsemane. It may fairly be assumed that to our Evangelist, as to the writer of John xxi. 18 f., Peter was one who had “followed ” Jesus in almost literal repetition of His sufferings. Mark x. 39 shows that He looked upon James and John as destined to fulfil, if not as having already fulfilled, the prophecy of the Lord that they should “drink of His cup.” From this point of view it will no longer seem strange that in a Gospel wherein Jesus’ pedagogic relation to the Twelve is more prominent than in any other,² Peter and James and John should be made the confidants of

¹ Confusion between “James the Just ” and James the son of Zebedee is frequent in post-apostolic literature.

² Cf. Mark iii. 14.

His wrestling with "him that had the power of death." They were the martyr apostles.

The facts we have presented are collected as indications that the New Testament itself contains confirmation of the strange new testimony that

Papias relates in his second book of the Oracles of the Lord, that John was slain by the Jews, fulfilling manifestly, together with his brother, the prediction of Christ concerning them, and their own confession and undertaking in the matter.¹

Their cogency will doubtless be variously judged, and must depend largely on the value attached to the alleged witness of Papias. Were space allowed, it might be possible to supplement their force by an examination of the confused and self-contradictory fragments, mainly from Hegesippus, regarding the martyrdom of James the Just. For the victim appears to suffer a double fate, now by precipitation and stoning, now by a fuller's club; now in the year 62, again immediately before "Vespasian besieged the city." Certainly Hegesippus implies that the only surviving relatives of the Lord were the two grandsons of Jude when these were brought before Domitian shortly after his accession. He plainly states that this marked the end of persecution on the score of Davidic pretensions. We cannot but infer that the martyrdom of the successor of James, Symeon the Lord's cousin, on the same charge, a martyrdom which Hegesippus dates under Trajan, at the age of 120 years (!), has undergone displacement.² Thebuthis, who at the return of the Christians after the siege entertains hopes of the leadership, and whose disappointment

¹ The MS. Coisl. 305 (tenth or eleventh century) of Georgius Hamartolus, published by Muralt (Petersburg 1859, p. xvii. f.). Cf. the fragment from Cod. Baroccianus 142 in the Bodleian library quoted above from de Boor, *T. u. U.* v. 2, p. 170.

² The motive would be again the prophecy of the surviving witness. Symeon represents the generation that should not pass away. His age

is, according to Hegesippus, the origin of heresy,¹ cannot be aware of the survival of John the Apostle, the "pillar," the near relative of the Lord. For how could he cherish such ambitions when

those of the apostles and disciples of the Lord that were still living came together from all directions with those that were related to the Lord according to the flesh (for the majority of them also were still alive) to take counsel as to who was worthy to succeed James.²

The unanimous choice of Symeon the Lord's cousin under these circumstances, to Thebuthis' chagrin, indicates an equally inexplicable forgetfulness on the part of the church. But the question of the inconsistencies of Hegesippus is too wide for present consideration, certainly wide enough to leave room for a martyrdom of John as well as James the Just in the troublous times antecedent to the Christians' withdrawal from the spiritual Sodom and Egypt.³

The question remains, How could the church pitch upon the very same individual who at an earlier time had been widely held in reverence as fulfilling the prophecy "Ye shall drink my cup" as the individual in whom was fulfilled the almost contradictory prophecy, "Some of them that stand by shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom"?

Some bearing on this question must certainly be conceded to the coincidence that one of the Elders⁴ of the Jerusalem

(120 years) is the Old Testament limit of human life (Gen. vi. 3; Deut. xxxiv. 7). Traditions of the survival of "witnesses" "until the times of Trajan" in the Jerusalem church parallel the later traditions of Ephesus.

¹ Another inconsistency. If heresy has its origin in the chagrin of Thebuthis in *circa* 70 the church cannot have remained, as claimed, virgin pure from heresy until the death of the last of the witnesses "in the times of Trajan."

² Eusebius *H.E.* III. xi., quoting apparently Hegesippus; also IV. xxii. 4-6.

³ The reference is to Lot's withdrawal and Israel's exodus. Cf. Luke xvii. 28-32.

⁴ In the Jerusalem church the links of the succession (*διαδοχή*) on which the second century laid such stress were reckoned as "Apostles

church, who survived, according to Epiphanius, until the year 117, bore this same name John. This Elder John (of Jerusalem), whom Papias still carefully distinguishes by the title from the apostle of the same name, is certainly confounded with him by Irenaeus in his quotations from Papias, and very probably also in his boyhood recollections of Polycarp's references to anecdotes of "John" about the Lord "concerning His miracles and His teaching." Since it is to Irenaeus and his contemporaries and fellow-defenders of the Johannine authorship of the Ephesian canon that we owe the tradition of John the Apostle as the long-surviving witness, this fact has certainly an important bearing. But by itself alone it cannot explain the well-nigh complete eclipse of the earlier tradition by the later. A more important factor is the interaction of the two conflicting "prophecies" of Jesus, facilitated by the ambiguity not of the mere Greek word *μάρτυς* but of the deeper-lying Semitic tradition of the "witnesses of Messiah," wherein both the martyrdom and the witness-bearing are original elements. Its Protean forms admit of adaptation to every contingency. Are there some still surviving of those who "stood by" when Jesus uttered His memorable assurance of vindication within the lifetime of the perverse generation which rejected Him? These may be the fulfilling counterparts of those apocalyptic "witnesses of Messiah" who were not to "taste of death" until they had seen and heralded the Lord's Christ.¹ Have two shared the Baptist's fate, and the rest departed before the coming of the Lord? Then these two may be ex-

and Elders" (Acts xi. 30, xv. 6, etc.), "the elders, the disciples of the Apostles" (Papias *ap. Iren. Haer. V. v. 1* and *passim*); not "bishops" as in the Greek churches. Under Hadrian this church still claimed as its leaders "the disciples of the disciples of the Apostles" (Epiph. *de mens. xv.*).

¹ The story of Simeon, Luke ii. 25 ff., as well as that of Zacharias, Luke 17, seems to have points of contact with the legend of the Forerunner.

pected to return with Him at His second advent, devouring their enemies with fire from heaven "as Elijah did." For this is precisely the rôle assigned by the church of Justin's day to its John the Baptist-Elias. The martyrdom also is a mark of the "witnesses." Surely in the long interval which intervened between the martyrdom of the two sons of Zebedee¹ there must have been some who began to ask whether the *μαρτυρία* of John might not be the tarrying witness.

Time is one great corrector of apocalypse. The spirit of Jesus was another. Rapidly after the seventies the course of events demonstrated the inadmissibility of both apocalyptic forms of the Christianized doctrine of "the witnesses of Messiah," the "tarrying" and the "following" *μαρτυρία*. The Pauline doctrine that the outpouring of the Spirit is the pledge of the *parousia* came to its predestined right. The very apocalypse which makes the martyr apostle its mouthpiece²—if indeed in the earlier Palestinian form of the book it be John and no other who is the seer that receives his revelation of "the things which must come to pass" in an anticipatory ascension in spirit to heaven³—even Revelation no longer holds to a literal fulfilment of the prophecy. Paulinism enters even here: "The *μαρτυρία* of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."⁴ With this interpretation it matters little whether the apostle-prophet "tarries" or "follows," the "witness" is given. Twenty years later the churches of Asia are passing through a new crisis. Persecution without is allied to heresy within. The prophet-witness of Jesus is invoked again. From

¹ To the present writer the theory of E. Schwartz (*Tod der Söhne Zebedaei*, 1904) of a simultaneous martyrdom of James and John in 44 A.D. seems to be excluded by Gal. ii. 9.

² With Rev. i. 9, "I John . . . partaker in the tribulation and kingdom . . . in Jesus," cf. Mark x. 37-40, Luke xxii. 28-30, 2 Tim. ii. 11 f.

³ With Rev. xi. 12 cf. iv. 1.

⁴ Rev. xix. 10.

Patmos, whither he is brought "for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus," he is made to deliver his message again in new and broader form to meet the double enemy on a wider field. This is not "forgery." Even if the pseudonymity be deliberate, this is simply the method of apocalypse, which has not one true representative among its multitude of productions that is not pseudonymous. Its strict parallel is found in the use of the authority of Peter against the same heretics in 2 Peter. The appendix to the Fourth Gospel furnishes the key to the history of the conflicting traditions of John the "following" and the "tarrying" witness, superseded as they could not fail to be by the Pauline-Johannine doctrine that the true prophet-witness of Messiah, refuting the false-prophecy of Antichrist-gnosis, abiding with the church until the coming of the Lord, is the "witness of the Spirit." But how inevitable it was that an age which took literally the symbolism of the prophet-apostle in Patmos, addressing "the churches of Asia," should cling to one form of the earlier "prophecy" of Jesus, and gradually build up for itself, first in Palestine, afterward, in Irenaeus' time, in Asia, the legend of the "tarrying Witness."

B. W. BACON.

THE GIFT OF TONGUES AT CORINTH.

IT is not likely that there ever will be complete unanimity on the vexed question of the nature of the Glossolalia. It is a question on which each one must endeavour to satisfy his own mind. Apart from the brief reference in the appendix to St. Mark's Gospel (Mark xvi. 17), our only sources of information are the accounts in Acts and 1 Corinthians.

Most recent writers on the subject start with the hypo-

thesis of the identical nature of the phenomena of Jerusalem and Corinth. The language of Luke in Acts ii., as it stands, undoubtedly makes speech in foreign languages a part of the phenomenon, but it is not so evident whether Paul in 1 Corinthians makes it such. The tendency in recent writers is to start with the words of Paul—to take them as the basis, and to examine the words of Luke in their light. The conclusions arrived at as regards Luke's narrative differ widely. Schmiedel, in his article on Spiritual Gifts in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (col. 4,761), holds that "the student who is not prepared to give up the genuineness of the principal Pauline Epistles is in duty stringently bound to consider the account of Paul as the primary one, and discuss it without even a side glance at Acts, and to reject as unhistorical everything in Acts which does not agree with this account." Zeller, Ramsay and Bartlet maintain that the account in Acts has been more or less embellished and distorted. Weiss can find no adequate solution. Wendt holds that Luke's account is a legendary embellishment. Blass thinks Luke's narrative has been influenced by dogmatic subjectivity. Dawson Walker, from whose recently published essay on the Gift of Tongues the above references are mostly taken, writes with the avowed object of vindicating Luke's credibility as a historian. He believes that the phenomena of Pentecost and Corinth were generically the same, but specifically different, the use of foreign languages being the specific characteristic of the glossolalia at Jerusalem. He vindicates Luke's historical accuracy by a full discussion of a possible *modus operandi*, maintaining (as does Wright in his *New Testament Problems*) that under the powerful influence of the Divine Spirit scraps of foreign phrases once heard were raised to the surface out of the subliminal self, and used by the speakers.

Most of the Fathers seem to have taken as their start-

ing-point the more definite words of Acts rather than the more obscure words of Paul, and to have interpreted the latter in the light of the former. This is what Origen does ; he extends the gift of Pentecost to include a permanent ability to speak in foreign languages, bestowed with a view to the evangelization of the heathen ; and in commenting on 1 Corinthians xiv. 18, he makes that passage refer to foreign languages, attributing to Paul along with the other Apostles the permanent faculty of proclaiming the Gospel in foreign tongues. In making the Gift of Tongues include this permanent endowment he was followed by several of the Fathers, including Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome and Augustine.

Now this article does not claim to be an attempt to consider the whole question ; it is but a preliminary step to such a task. It is an examination of Paul's references to the glossolalia in 1 Corinthians, with the object of ascertaining whether his words give any countenance to the view that the use of foreign languages formed any part of the phenomenon at Corinth. The obscurity of his language is largely due to the fact that he is answering the questions addressed to him by the Corinthians.

In the work already referred to Dawson Walker says : " It is a matter of the greatest interest to observe that in some of the most recent literature on Acts in English there is a distinctly conservative reaction, a return to the older point of view (i.e., as regards Corinth)—for the view that speech in foreign languages formed an element in the glossolalia at Corinth would seem to be as old as Origen " (p. 37). He adds as his own opinion : " St. Paul's language then is not such as, in itself, to exclude the supposition that foreign languages formed part of the glossolalia at Corinth, provided that this view can be shown to be, on other grounds, probable " (p. 42).

Wright, in the article on the Gift of Tongues in *New Testa-*

ment Problems (p. 285), quotes the late Dean Farrar as saying that "it is impossible for any one to examine 1 Corinthians xii.-xiv. 33, carefully without being forced to the conclusion that at Corinth, at any rate, the gift of tongues had not the least connexion with foreign languages." He then proceeds to say that he has done the "impossible" and has come to the conclusion that "though some of St. Paul's illustrations undoubtedly favour the theory of incoherent noises, yet his application of them does not do so, and, on the whole, foreign languages are certainly implied." On pp. 285-6 he mentions several details in Paul's references which to him are indications of the use of foreign languages; we hope to show that all these point in the opposite direction.

Alford held that the use of foreign tongues was part of the phenomenon at Corinth, and Chase (*Credibility of the Acts*, p. 38) says: "The probabilities of the case then, and the language used by St. Paul, alike give support to the view that speech in a foreign language was one among the many forms of glossolalia at Corinth."

The object of this article is to show from a study of Paul's words that the absence of foreign languages is distinctly implied.

We shall consider, first, Paul's terminology, then, his illustrations, and, finally, his statements concerning the utility of the glossolalia.

The first part of our inquiry will show, as we believe, that Paul's terminology would, considered by itself, indicate the use of foreign languages at Corinth, while the rest of our study will prove almost conclusively that speech in foreign tongues was not an element of the phenomenon. Before considering the illustrations and the utility of the gift, we will anticipate the conclusions of our study of them and suggest a solution of the discrepancy between Paul's terminology and the natural implication of his words.

I. TERMINOLOGY.

The terms used by Paul in reference to the phenomenon are *γλῶσσαι* (xiii. 8), *γένη γλωσσῶν* (xii. 10 and 28), *γλώσση λαλεῖν* (xiv. 13), and, even when referring to a single individual, the plural *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* (xiv. 6); of the interpretation he uses *ἐρμηνεία* (the MS. L reads *διερμηνεία* in xii. 10—a word not found elsewhere); but the verb he employs is the compound *διερμηνεύειν*.

Now what is the most natural meaning to give to the word *γλῶσσαι*? We need not make more than a passing reference to the view of Ernesti and Herder (referred to by Edwards, in his Commentary, p. 320) that they were “unusual, antiquated, figurative and poetical expressions,” or to Meyer’s view that the *γλῶσσα* in these chapters is the bodily member; as Edwards pointedly remarks, on this latter view no meaning can be attached to *γένη γλωσσῶν* and *ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν*. Edwards remarks that the religious use of *γλῶσσα* to designate the ecstatic response of an oracle is more to the purpose than some of the explanations offered (p. 321), but finds “the reason for the name in the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost in the shape of tongues as of fire” (p. 323). Though we cannot adopt this as the real explanation of the use of the word, we believe that the name given to the phenomenon at Pentecost was employed long after the nature of the phenomenon had changed. We will return to this point presently.

The only two meanings that can naturally be applied to the word *γλῶσσαι* are: (1) languages, (2) utterances. Of the meanings given in Liddell and Scott these are the only ones at all applicable here. If we had only the word *γλῶσσαι* to consider, there would be no difficulty in taking it to mean *utterances*, but the combination of *γλῶσσαι* and the compound *διερμηνεύειν* cannot easily be accounted for except on the supposition that the words refer to *languages* and

their translation. It is true that *διερμηνεύειν* is without doubt used in one passage in the New Testament (Luke xxiv. 27) in the sense of "to explain" or "expound," while the simple verb means "to translate" in two passages (John ix. 7 and Heb. vii. 2; it is not the correct reading in John i. 38); still it is almost impossible to conceive of any one taking this combination, standing alone, as referring to anything but languages. The expression *γένη γλωσσῶν*, twice used by Paul in his enumeration of the charismata, shows that the phenomenon was by no means uniform, and may be taken to suggest that the glossolalia at Corinth was different from that of Pentecost.

Our explanation of the Apostle's use of a terminology which implies speech in foreign languages, when his words give us clearly to understand (if we may anticipate the conclusions of the rest of our study) that foreign languages were not an element of the phenomenon, is that the terminology is a relic of former days. In the quarter of a century that had elapsed between Pentecost and the time when 1 Corinthians was written, the glossolalia had greatly changed. At Pentecost those filled with the Spirit spoke in foreign languages and the listeners (whether acquainted with the *Κοινή* or not) heard them praising God in their own tongues—the languages they best knew. Now the gift was continued in the Church, as the references of Acts x. 44–46, xi. 15 and xix. 6 show, and the truths uttered could be directly understood and appreciated by persons knowing the language or languages employed. The natural term to use for a person that translated from one language to another would be *διερμηνευτής*, and the original speakers would be said *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*. Gradually the use of foreign tongues ceased to be a part of the phenomenon; when Paul wrote this letter it formed no part of the glossolalia at Corinth. However, the old terminology was retained, and

in 1 Corinthians *διερμηνεύειν* means to expound the significance, and, by spiritual sympathy, to interpret the condition of ecstatic rapture. Such was the nature of the gift at Corinth; the persons who spoke with tongues in their ecstasy addressed themselves to God in prayer and praise, but not at all to their fellows.

We now proceed to show from a consideration of Paul's illustrations and his references to the utility of the gift that foreign languages formed no part of the glossolalia at Corinth.

II. PAUL'S ILLUSTRATIONS.

In chapter xiv. 7 f. Paul uses three illustrations or comparisons, a careful examination of which will show that the use of foreign languages was not part of the *γλωσσολαλία*.

(a) *The Musical Instrument*.—Paul mentions the *αἶλος* and the *κιθάρα* as examples of the "things without life" which he uses as illustrations (verse 7). *Φθόγγος* in this verse means simply "sound." Liddell and Scott refer to several passages in which it means the *sound* of an instrument as distinguished from a *voice*. It is difficult to think that *διαστολή* is here used in any technical, musical sense. The only musical meaning given in Liddell and Scott is "pause," and their only reference is to this passage. The word means (cf. *διαστέλλω*) "separation," "distinction" (so R.V.), and Paul's meaning is that if the sound emitted by the flute or lyre is not broken up into notes, if it is nothing but mere sound, it will convey no meaning. If the sound is but one unvarying noise, not separated into the proper notes, it will answer no good purpose. There is not the least suggestion in Paul's words that the person who hears the sound would not be capable of appreciating good music if the instrument gave out such; indeed the contrary is implied. The reason that no sense of harmony reaches the hearer is not his inability to welcome it, but the fact

that the instrument does not produce it. The fault is in the instrument, not in the hearer. Now if at Corinth the speaker with tongues gave utterance to the mysteries of God in any *language*, and the hearers failed to apprehend their significance because of their ignorance of that language, then Paul's comparison would be most inadequate and even misleading. Had the case been one of inability to understand what was uttered in a foreign tongue, would not Paul have written after this manner: "If a flute or a lyre gave forth the sublimest music imaginable, but the person who listened had no ear for music and were unable to appreciate it, the music would be lost"? Surely the very form in which the comparison is given proves that the utterance of coherent statements in any language formed no part of the glossolalia at Corinth.

(b) *The War-trumpet* (verse 8).—The same applies to this second comparison. The value of a war-trumpet depends upon the understanding between the person that blows it and the person that hears it as to the significance of pre-arranged notes. There is no suggestion in this verse that the soldiers were unable to distinguish and understand the different signals when correctly given. As in the first illustration, the fault lies with the instrument, not with those who hear it. The soldier is not ignorant of what to expect, but the *σάλπιγξ*, instead of giving out its *φωνή* according to the prearranged understanding, gives out an *ἄδηλος φωνή*, that is, one that conveys no clear meaning to the hearer; it is a mere sound to him. Again we submit that if the speaker with a tongue at Corinth was wont to utter great spiritual truths in a foreign language, and if nothing but ignorance of the particular language employed prevented the other members of the Church from understanding what was said, it is inconceivable that Paul should have stated the comparison in the way he does. Would he not

rather have spoken of the war-trumpet giving forth a clear signal to advance, and of the soldier who does not stir because he understands not the meaning of the signal ?

(c) *Human Speech* (verses 9 ff.).—In verse 9 Paul commences his application to the glossolalia of the foregoing illustrations, introducing it with the words *οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς*. It is the same, he says, with sound uttered by the human tongue. If this be nothing but sound, it conveys no meaning and answers no purpose. *Τῆς γλώσσης* almost certainly refers to the bodily member, and not to the Divine gift, as some affirm; for one thing, *γλῶσσα* is invariably anarthrous when used of the charism. Paul, however, has not proceeded far with his application when the reference to human utterance suggests to his active mind a third illustration. As is his wont, he immediately grasps the new thought, and expands it in verses 10 and 11. For the moment he forgets his application, and has to resume it by means of the *οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς* of verse 12. This second *οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς* proves beyond all doubt that the reference to the *γένη φωνῶν* in verses 10 and 11 is of the nature of a comparison or illustration, and not a part of the intended application. "Think," says Paul, "of the innumerable dialects in a world like this (anarthrous *κόσμος*); each answers the purpose of a dialect." This seems to be the natural rendering of *καὶ οὐδὲν ἄφωνον*. The rendering of R.V. misrepresents the Greek, as *φωνή* can hardly mean "signification." It is true that it is used in Sophocles (*Ant.* 1206) for articulate as opposed to inarticulate sound, but even there its reference is to the *sound* and not to the *signification*. "Dialect," however, is one of its recognized meanings in the classical writers, and there is nothing strained in Paul's use of the singular in verse 11 for "an utterance in a dialect." "Now," says the Apostle, "an utterance in any of these dialects answers no good purpose, conveys no thought to me, unless I know its mean-

ing." *Δύναμις* is frequently found in Plato in the sense it bears here.

We come to the conclusion then that Paul refers to different languages or dialects *as an illustration* of the *γλωσσολαλία*. Would he do so if the *γλωσσολαλία* itself were foreign speech? A comparison implies a difference as well as a similarity. We do not use identical things to illustrate each other. The very fact that Paul makes the comparison of verses 10 and 11 proves that speech in foreign languages was not part of the *γλωσσολαλία* at Corinth.

III. THE UTILITY OF THE GIFT.

We still have to consider Paul's remarks on the utility of the Glossolalia. Our study will, we believe, serve to strengthen our conviction that speaking in foreign languages formed no part of the phenomenon. It is evident that Paul had no high opinion of its usefulness at Corinth. It is only to be tolerated (xiv. 39). Though ranked first, seemingly, by the sensation-loving Corinthians, Paul gives it a very low place in the list (xii. 10). He does not regard it as one of the "greater charisms" (xii. 31). He emphasizes its inferiority to prophecy in all probability because the Corinthians in their church-letter had questioned him as to the relative value of these two gifts.

One reason why Paul disparages the Gift of Tongues as compared with the other gifts is that it was only of partial utility for the speaker himself. His *πνεῦμα* only was concerned; his *νοῦς* was *ἄκαρπος* (xiv. 14). The intellectual side of the man was not touched. But more than this, the gift had in itself no value for the other members of the Church, and for the conversion of the unbeliever it was practically ineffective. Let us consider these two points: (a) its partial value for the Church, (b) its ineffectiveness for the conversion of the outsider.

(a) *Its partial value for the Church.*—Again and again Paul calls attention to the fact that, without interpretation, speaking in a tongue cannot “build up” the hearers. The speaker, it is true, builds himself up (xiv. 4) in that he feels the nearness of God during the ecstatic trance. It is a matter of the heart rather than of the mind. He indeed speaks the mysteries of God—but “in spirit” only (verse 2). The lips give out meaningless sound as though endeavouring to utter the emotions of the soul. He speaks to God, not to men, for no one hears understandingly (*ἀκούει*, verse 2). Unless the person speaking interprets these mysterious emotions, or another for him, the Church derives no benefit. If the *πνεῦμα* alone is employed in praising God (as is the case in the glossolalia), then the person who is without the gift is not influenced: how can he say the customary “Amen” (*τὸ Ἀμήν*)? (verse 16). Paul goes on to say that in his own private life he made greater use of the gift than any of them, “but,” he adds, “in a church-assembly [emphatic by position] I had rather speak five words with my *νοῦς*, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue” (verses 18, 19). We see also from verses 26 ff. that the exercise of this gift without interpretation is of no benefit to the Church, for the general principle “Let everything be carried on with a view to edification,” is followed by a number of restrictions as to the use of glossolalia; not more than two or three were to speak in the church-assembly, but if there was no one present to interpret, the speaker was to be silent in the church and speak to God in the privacy of his own home. Paul could see no value in the glossolalia for the Church-members.

Now at Corinth all the nationalities of east and west would meet; here, if anywhere, the Church would include persons of different races speaking many languages. The slave-population of Corinth was large and varied; as elsewhere,

slaves were attracted in numbers to the Christian Church. What could be of greater benefit to the worshippers than to hear the mysteries of God declared in their native tongues? Most of them would be more or less acquainted with the *Κοινή*; but how it would quicken their interest and stimulate them in every way to hear the praises of God uttered in the language of their childhood! Welsh people in England, who use English all the week, prefer to worship on the Sunday in their native Welsh. If the gift at Corinth included the use of foreign languages, would not Paul be quick to see its value? would he not foster it, instead of merely tolerating it? The fact that Paul sees no value in it for the rest of the Church in a place such as Corinth goes far to show that speaking in various languages formed no part of the manifestation.

(b) *Its ineffectiveness for the conversion of the outsider.*—This is Paul's subject in that difficult section xiv. 20–25, in which occurs the quotation from Isaiah xxviii. The words ὥστε (verse 22) and οὖν (verse 23) point to the logical unity of this section. At first sight Paul seems to contradict himself, for he says that Tongues are εἰς σημεῖον τοῖς ἀπίστοις, and then proceeds to show that the ἀπίστοι derive no benefit from it, while Prophecy is εἰς σημεῖον οὐ τοῖς ἀπίστοις ἀλλὰ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, but benefits the ἀπίστοι as well as the πιστεύοντες. Is it possible to arrive at an exposition of these words that will harmonize with all the statements of the section? Before endeavouring to explain the words let us state some conditions which a correct exposition must satisfy—

(1) It must take cognizance of the fact that Jehovah's use of the Assyrian speakers in Isaiah's day was punitive.

(2) It must repeat εἰς σημεῖον in the second clause of verse 22.

(3) It must give εἰς σημεῖον the same meaning in both clauses.

(4) It must take *ἄπιστος* in the same sense in verses 22, 23 and 24.

Most of the expositions given seem to come short of satisfying one or more of these conditions.

In Isaiah xxviii. the prophet declares that the punishment which has fallen on Samaria is to fall on Jerusalem as well. His words are met with scorn. The rulers at Jerusalem think themselves superior to the plain message of prophecy, delivered "precept upon precept, line upon line" (verse 10). Because of their stubbornness Jehovah will enforce His lessons by cruel masters using the Assyrian tongue. Their refusal to hear the direct message of prophecy proved their unworthiness to receive such a message and rendered them still less worthy to receive and less able to appreciate it. God, therefore, in retribution, brings His method to their level and speaks to them "by men of strange lips and with another tongue." Now each of these messages from God was a *σημείον*: the object of the strange words, though they were partly punitive, was to lead men to put their trust in Him, but the second *σημείον* was less calculated to serve this purpose than the first. All this suggests to the Apostle's mind a double comparison. The plain prophetic message and the strange words of the Assyrian invaders correspond to the gifts of Prophecy and Tongues at Corinth, the one being an intelligible declaration of God's will, the other nothing but meaningless sound. He also likens the believing Church-members at Corinth to the rulers of Jerusalem when worthy to receive the plain words of prophecy and the unbelieving outsider to the same persons when, hardened by their obstinacy, they were unable to value the words of the prophet and were worthy only to hear punitive words delivered in an unknown tongue. The comparison must not be expected to hold good in all its details. Paul is not comparing the believer and the outsider in regard to moral

responsibility, but only as regards spiritual attainment. "Now," Paul seems to say in verse 22, "I recognize that both Prophecy and Tongues are *σημεῖα* from God; both are signs of His presence; the object of both is to influence men for good. But Prophecy stands on a higher level. It is a *σημεῖον* such as God would send to those who believe, while the glossolalia is such a *σημεῖον* as He would send by way of chastisement to unbelievers." Naturally, then, we should expect Prophecy to have a more elevating influence than Tongues, not only on the *πιστεύοντες* but on the *ἄπιστοι* as well. "And is not that what usually happens?" asks Paul: "unbelieving outsiders look in from curiosity at your church-assemblies. When they see and hear you speak in tongues they are hardened; they scoff and say you are mad; but when they hear the clear words of prophecy they are led to recognize the presence of God among His people" (verses 23-25).

We are aware that objections may be raised to this interpretation of the section, but it seems to us to be the one that best harmonizes with all the facts of the case. Whatever be the precise interpretation, it is evident that Paul could see no great value in the gift of Tongues for the conversion of the outsider.

Again and again at Corinth a foreign sailor or a foreign slave, knowing his native language better than he knew the *Κοινή* would by chance find his way to the church-assembly. What would touch the heart of such a person as much as to hear the mysteries of God in his own tongue? There are many cases on record of persons being greatly influenced by unexpectedly hearing spiritual truths declared in their own tongue. If the gift had included ability to speak in foreign languages, would Paul have disparaged it *at Corinth*? Would he not rather have valued it highly as a divinely sent means for the evangelization of the vast foreign population of that

heathen city? Again we are driven to the conclusion that the use of foreign speech formed no part of the glossolalia at Corinth.

The result of our investigation of Paul's language, then, is that the Glossolalia was an ecstatic spiritual rapture—a state of deep emotion during which utterance was given to meaningless incoherent sounds, such sounds not taking shape in the intelligible words of any language. We have suggested too that the expressions which seem to point to the use of foreign languages are the relics of an older terminology belonging to a time when the use of such was an element in the phenomenon.

JOHN H. MICHAEL.

THE DRAMATIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

THE dramatic progress of the Fourth Gospel is a testimony to the frequently challenged organic unity of the work. In his description of the Master's action and passion the writer's art is no less conspicuous than in the manner in which he has set forth the growth of His teaching. As in the *Ædipus Tyrannus*, the masterpiece of Attic tragedy, superb delineation of character is here united with the highest constructive skill. In his presentation of the drama of the "Word-made-flesh" the art of the writer secured that the climax should be approached by scenes of rising interest, a development of plot, character and purpose, a process which arises naturally out of the conditions of the tragedy itself, depends not upon artificial intervention and culminates at the supreme moment in a surprising reversal of fortune, a *περιπέτεια* which in this Gospel is the choice—"Not this man, but Barabbas."

Although occupied with the sublime discourses and the glory-glimpses of the Word, the Evangelist does not lose sight of the lower elements of time and place on which its value as history depends. For its historical relation to the other Gospels, as supplement, is obvious and mutual. The writer stops the gaps that occur in the Synoptic narrative, at the same time marshalling his facts and incidents so that they should bear directly or indirectly upon the central issue and illuminate the central figure. But he relates the events that happened immediately after the temptation, the call of the disciples, the return to Galilee, the marriage in Cana, the stay at Capernaum, the visit to Jerusalem during the Passover, and the ministry of Jesus in Judaea, while John was baptizing in Aenon, not so much with the view to fill up the hiatus in the Synoptic records as to explain the Judæan situation and the spiritual environment of Jesus, and so to prepare his readers from the outset for that combination of circumstances which bore the Saviour onwards to His cross. The return to Galilee in chapter iv. 43-54 is the same as that noticed in Mark (i. 14): "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came to Galilee"; but is mentioned by the Apostle, "because Jesus Himself testified that a prophet hath no honour in his own country," and therefore it has a significant connexion with the climax. The reception given by the Galileans is an effective contrast with the indifference of the Jews, and the sign in Cana which awakened faith is a foil to the sign in the Temple which aroused opposition. The miracle of the Five Thousand is followed by a record of that discourse in the synagogue of Capernaum which succeeded and interpreted it, because it was the cause of the falling away of many of His disciples (vi. 66), and so gave occasion to the Master to make that effective appeal to His disciples—"Will ye also go away?"—which He followed up with that solemn de-

claration that throws a shadow over the whole story, and causes us to look for elements of treason, the material for tragedy, in His own circle. "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" (vi. 70). This saying was not related by John to show that he was aware of the selection of the Twelve, but because of its inherent importance in the development of the drama, and is therefore of great value as a point of independent and unconscious coincidence.

The writer records the Lord's missions to Jerusalem not merely because they are omitted by the Synoptists, but because they indicate the development of the drama of the Saviour's life. To those visits the words of impassioned eloquence recorded by St. Matthew allude: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often did I wish to gather thy children to Me, as the mother bird gathers her chickens under her wings but ye did not wish" (Matt. xxiii. 24). The period of six months that intervened between the events describe in the sixth chapter and the seventh is not indicated by the words, "Now the Jews' feast of the Passover was nigh," in order to give a corrected chronology of our Lord's life, but in order to prepare us for a further development of the Jewish hatred and sinister designs. "For He was not willing to walk in Judaea because the Jews sought to kill Him." And yet the Synoptists' record of the Galilean ministry fits in here. The withdrawal of Jesus into Peraea, the place where John used to baptize at first (xi. 40-42), is not intended by the writer to throw an additional light upon Matthew xix. 1, "And it came to pass when Jesus finished these sayings, He withdrew from Galilee and came into the coasts of Judaea beyond Jordan," although it does do so, but to indicate that new scene of missionary activity which was to be the vantage ground from which the Saviour made His last attempt to win the holy city.

The Resurrection of Lazarus, almost a distinct episode in this Gospel, is fully related because of its important bearing on the events that followed. For a report of this miracle led to the calling of the Sanhedrin, the political utterance of Caiaphas which became prophetic, and the determination of the chief priests to kill Jesus (xi. 53), and Lazarus with Him (xvii. 10), "for many of the Jews went away because of him and believed in Jesus." But there are naturally many cross references to the Synoptic record which are invaluable to the harmonist. For example, Bethany, "the village of Mary and her sister Martha," refers us back to St. Luke x. 38-39. The epilogue of the Gospel records several events, the fishing in Galilee, and the repentant Peter's commission, in order to indicate the lines of further development, but indirectly it confirms the statement in St. Matthew's Gospel, "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee into the mountain where Jesus had appointed them" (xxviii. 16), and it interprets the draught of fishes of St. Luke v. by another that is to supersede it.

The plan of the writer is, therefore, historical, if his object is doctrinal. His dogmas are facts, and his facts become dogmas. He approaches his subject from the side of experience, from what he has seen and what he knows and believes. As the revelation of the Son was historical and progressive, the effect of that revelation is also historical and progressive. As there were many steps in His self-revelation, so there were many steps in men's belief concerning Him. His Divinity was not revealed at once, nor was it directly accepted. The development of faith is punctuated by certain crises called hours, the stages in the battle of faith and doubt. These "hours" are peculiar to the Gospel, which exhibits that conflict with singular dramatic intensity. They are a striking feature in the Gospel. The dramatic genius of the writer seized on certain points in the life of

Jesus which mark the development of the tragedy in which He is the chief actor, certain well-defined periods of time which mark the advancing stages of His work and sacrifice, certain landmarks which indicate the steady advance of His great purpose to lay down His life for the world, until it reaches its final catastrophe on the cross. The one supreme event to which His life moved forward was not attained at one rush, but by a series of onward movements, each of which carried Him further than the last, that are to be attributed as much to a Divine plan as to the course of human passions. These epochs are powerfully used by the writer, who knew, as every student of humanity knows, that the lives of the greatest men naturally fall into distinct epochs, junctures, crises, tragedies.

Hour (*ώρα*) in the Fourth Gospel is, therefore, to be distinguished from time (*καιρός*). The former is dependent on the will of God—the ruling principle of the Saviour's life as love was His ruling passion—while the latter signifies opportuneness with regard to human affairs; a contrast which again meets us in the distinction between “therefore” (*οὖν*) or natural sequence and “in order that” (*ἵνα*) or divine purpose. “Hour” in this Gospel accordingly means a special point of development or transition in the Divine plan, a well-marked stage in the progress of the Divine life on earth full of interest and influence for humanity, a psychological moment in the evolution of the Messianic consciousness full of significance for the Saviour's purpose, the salvation of the race and the accomplishment of the Father's will, the will Divine which is so permanently before His mind and which has been well described by Dante as—

The sea to which creation moves.

To specialize, “Mine hour is not yet come” (ii. 4) means

something more than "it were too soon for Me to begin My work." It signifies that "the special time mapped out for Me by My Father, in which I am to reveal the Father and Myself to mankind, has not yet come. That critical juncture in My life when I must surrender my home ties, when I must forswear all the attachments of My humanity, when I must manifest My divine power, has not yet arrived. I am waiting the Father's sign." That "hour" was a memorable one in the Saviour's life as the Son of man and the chosen One of God. And it came soon afterwards in the purification of the Temple during the Passover of the Jews. Thus the crisis in the life of the national Deliverer coincided with the commemoration of that historic crisis in the national life when the people were led by Jehovah out of darkness into light.

But there is an even more telling and powerful use of this expression "hour" in the seventh and eighth chapters, viz., "they sought to take Him; but no man laid hands on Him, because His *hour* was not yet come." In these chapters we notice the growing hostility, the gathering opposition of the Jews to the teaching of Jesus. They were now beginning to see the drift of His revelation. His claim to be a heaven-sent teacher they bitterly resented. And from their point of view they had reason. For were they not the upholders of the orthodox and traditional teaching of Judaism, which this Galilean *parvenu* sought to uproot and destroy? There were many steps in our Lord's self-revelation. He revealed Himself as the expected Messiah to His own disciples and they acknowledged that claim, but He often hinted that He was something more. On this occasion, when He declared His Messiahship to the world openly in the temple, and proclaimed that, although without the credentials of any Jewish school, He had a mission from God, the leaders of the people were so exasperated that they

would have taken Him, but "no man laid hands on Him, for His hour was not come." The picture is in vivid but pathetic light. We see the keen anxiety written on the brows of the apostles as they stand around their Lord—the only calm and self-possessed one in all that crowd. We read the fierce indignation and wrath on the countenances of the priests and elders, in their hands lifted up to strike, in their uncertain and excited movements. But the murderous hands are divinely held back. The Master is mysteriously delivered. Matters are hastening to a crisis. The hour which commemorated a crisis in the national history of Israel, the feast of tabernacles, was to mark the development of a crisis in the Messiah's life. But the crisis has not yet come. The tragic hour is prolonged, and its pathos intensified as we wait with eager expectation to hear the result, to see the end. But the end is not yet. There is another cup of sorrows to drink, another crown of sorrows to wear. The malice of Christ's foes has not yet triumphed over the manifest goodness of His life and doctrine which appeals to so many of their number. For the hand of God is there, above all things, supernaturally directing all events to their proper issues by His outstretched arm, until the time is ripe and the circle of the Saviour's life is complete. With the postponement of the supreme event our suspense is renewed. But the postponement leads to greater revelation, advancing stages in His action and passion, His doing and suffering.

Artistic beyond words, but not in the least artificial, is the manner in which the Apostle seized upon that marvellous hesitation of the Jews to arrest the Man they so desired to arrest, and sketches it in graphic lines so that we can almost see the plot as it progresses and the conflict as it develops.

Another well-marked "hour" in the Master's life is the visit of the Greeks. Recognizing the significance of the request and coming of these strangers He said: "The hour

is come that the Son of man should be glorified." But the next moment His mood passes into one of great trouble as He contemplates the terrible nature of the conflict that awaits Him before the conquest can be won. Whether flashed upon His consciousness in a moment or gradually revealed by the Divine process, the truth has been brought home to His soul that He is the seed-corn that is to be dissolved in the ground, and from which a new principle of spiritual life is to go forth to regenerate mankind. And His inward struggle betrays itself in that broken sentence : " What shall I say ? Father, save me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour." It was not death itself, but all that lay before it, and the weighty consequences that were involved in that awful *agon* with sin and all its powers that troubled Him. In comparison with such issues the terrible humiliations and suspense of the death He was to die was a small matter. It was the dark shadow that lay before His death that made Him for a moment feel unequal to the task and cry out in tones of indecision : " What must I say ? " But in his hour of distress His trust came to His aid. " Father," He cries, " bring Me safely out of this hour." He prays not for release from it, but that He may be brought safely through it and out of it. Therefore He adds, " And yet on this account came I unto this hour." And the thought of the Father's glory, even in His own shame, buoyed Him up and made Him hail with gladness the final grapple with sin and weakness, the approaching severance from earthly love and life that was to issue in the salvation of man and redound to the glory of God. " Father, glorify Thy name. Reveal Thy fatherly nature to mankind. And there came a voice from heaven, " I have glorified it, and will glorify it again." And Jesus said, " This voice came not for My sake, but for yours." There was no need that the word should be uttered aloud in order to reach His

heart. His inward struggle is over and His Passion is commencing, and is to issue in a triumph that shall prove a sentence on the world's standards of beauty and pleasure because it shall end in the defeat and expulsion of the ruler of this world. "For," He said, "if so be that I be lifted up, I shall draw men to Myself." Here we notice that the tone of Divine assertiveness is immediately checked. "If so be that I be lifted up," He said, knowing the frailty of His human nature, knowing that all things were in His Father's hands and that His very life depended on that Father. The hour is approaching and His flesh is shrinking from the greatness of the contest that was to reach another climax of agony in Gethsemane. There is unspeakable pathos in the Greek word *ἐάν*. The whole scene, described with so much naïveté and power, reveals depths of the Saviour's soul. There is infinite suffering and self-control in the broken sentences of the soliloquy: "Now is My soul troubled and what shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour."

The weakness is mastered and pain passes into exultation. "Father, glorify Thy name." But there is justice, stern justice in the cry, "Now is the judgement of this world. Now shall the prince of this world be cast out." The victory is to the good. The moral forces of righteousness and truth shall prevail over all that makes for selfishness and sin. Again, the words that introduce the scene in the Upper Room—"Jesus, knowing that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end"—add a strange thrill to the description of the feet-washing. The wonderful self-mastery and self-forgetfulness of the Master of men is nowhere revealed with such power and pathos as in the scene where His foreknowledge must add poignancy to His own pain, but

where His sympathy with others causes Him to forget the sorrow of which His divine nature makes Him doubly conscious. And the tragic situation is intensified by the daemonic presence of Judas, in whom the spirit of hatred has now free course. The dramatic genius of the writer caused him to seize upon this contrast of Judas' hate and Jesus' love. For the dark shadow of such hate throws into bolder relief the glory of such love.

In his description of the prayer of Jesus, the writer again is most natural. And such naturalness is beyond the reach of art. For as the Master had concluded this discourse He lifted up His eyes to heaven and said, "Father, the hour is come ; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify Thee." Strange are the words of rapture and yearning that follow. The Saviour's mood is highly exalted. The tone of jubilation arises from the sense of the nearness of the crisis. The protection, the sanctification, the union, the perfection and the love of His disciples—these are the themes which He would naturally choose at such a time. And the words that conclude the prayer, "O righteous Father, the world hath not known Thee, but I have known Thee, and these have known that Thou hast sent Me. And I have declared unto them Thy Name, and will declare it ; that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them and I in them," carry us over Gethsemane and its dark agony. For upon that gloomy picture the Evangelist dare not linger. It has already been painted by others. And to pause to describe it now were to lose the lofty tone of self-surrender in which these words are uttered. The action now becomes quicker, the language more terse, the characters more numerous. The drama progresses towards its climax. But in the same calm tone of devotion He rebukes the violence of Peter and He hails the approach of the end : "The cup which My Father hath given Me, shall I

not drink it ? ” (xviii. 11). No more inward struggles are related, no harrowing details are added. The Evangelist describes the closing scenes from the vantage ground of his after life. The end, indeed, is death, but death means accomplishment and victory. The Father is glorified in the self-sacrifice of the Son and His will “is finished.” Thus the perfect life is rounded off, and our impression is not one of infinite sorrow but of pain dissolved in the joy of victory. The spiritual order is not dependent on the world of sense. It submits, but in its submission is the prophecy of triumph. Such is the process of this drama, which turns upon spiritual love and worldly hate, belief and unbelief. Into its texture are interwoven many episodes that serve to illuminate the Master’s character and environment. Many light, vivid touches give life and movement to the tragedy, while sharply contrasted characters and situations serve to throw into greater prominence the central figure of the Christ. There is much skill, for example, in the portrayal of Judas. Subtle, silent and solitary, he is like a serpent in his impassiveness. His character is an enigma. If questioned on the motive of his crime, he would probably retort like Iago—

Demand me nothing, what you know you know ;
From this time forth I never will speak word.

His presence is a dark shadow that grows larger on the wall and spells death to his Master and ruin to himself. Of that baneful influence the Master is painfully conscious : “ Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is *διάβολος* ? ” (devil, vi. 70). The Jews declared that Jesus and John the Baptist had devils (*δαιμόνιον ἔχεις*, vii. 20 ; Matt. xi. 18), meaning that they were full of strange fancies. But this word has a sinister sense. One of the Twelve is a perverter of good unto evil, a slanderer and enemy of the good. And his question, “ Why was not this ointment sold for three hun-

dred pence and given to the poor? (xii. 15)'' shows it. In the Upper Room the Master becomes keenly sensitive of the malign presence. And the writer of the drama makes the readers share that feeling by using his colours in such a way that the chief interest is centred in Jesus and that silent figure by His side, into whose heart the devil had already put the betrayal of his Master. After the feet-washing, Jesus said, "I speak not of you all. I know whom I have chosen. But that the scripture may be fulfilled, 'He that eateth bread with Me hath lifted up his heel against Me.' Then He became troubled in spirit and testified and said, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray Me.''' To the disciple that He loved best, Jesus reveals the name of him that loved Him least. And after the sop Satan entered into Judas, and Jesus said, "What thou doest, do quickly." And he having received the sop went immediately out and the dark curtain of night falls upon him and his treason. After his retirement there is a strong reaction in the Saviour's mood. He is now able to pour out the wealth of His love unrestrained by any hostile influence. Now He can say, "Now is the Son of man glorified." For the haggard shadow of Judas has been swallowed up in the night. The whole scene is recorded with dramatic power and verve. What is narrative in the Synoptists is tragedy here. For the sentence is pronounced without reprieve, at all events as far as this world is concerned, by Him who for judgment came into the world: "And not one of them is lost save the son of perdition."

On the whole, the general effect of the Apostle's art is that the Saviour's life is presented in one long divinely protracted contest, one great continuous sacrifice. The cross is anticipated by the Baptist's words, "Behold the Lamb of God." The glory cloud of the Word shines upon the silver page but the letters are written in blood-red type,

and the words of life and love throb with the thought of the uplifting of the Son of man and the dissolving of the Divine corn seed in the fields of human life. In this life of the Master there is a gathering intensity of meaning, a climacteric force in the marshalling of events. The story gathers glory as it moves from eternity to eternity, while the writer grows in dramatic power as he presses forward to write the tragedy of the life of the Son of God who became the Son of man to make the sons of men sons of God. As the manifestation of God's grace, and the revelation of God's truth in human characters, that life is graphically and dramatically conceived. Around it surges the battle of faith and doubt, of darkness and light. The tragic interest of the contest rises as the plot thickens. We are carried onwards over a smooth but deep-flowing and resistless river of life, until the tide has us in its grasp and we are borne

Wonderfully and fearfully afar
Out to the mighty main.

As in a great drama our attention is secured from the very first and we endure one throbbing hour of suspense until the crisis has come and gone. So in this gospel, the hour of agony is long drawn out, the climax to which we are hastening is postponed time after time, while the plot slowly ripens to catastrophe and the sorrow's crown of sorrows is surely won.

Nor is the conflict only between the Word and His foes, those who will not accept His revelation, those who oppose Him at every point, but also between His humanity and His Divinity. His flesh shrinks from the contest. His flesh feels unkindness and depression. His soul is keenly sensitive of the slightest breath of hostility. There are no unlawful desires in Him, but there is yet a discord over which He triumphs. For He—the Author of our salvation—was made morally perfect by sufferings (Heb. ii. 10),

and His life of moral struggle with the powers of evil is crowned by a victory which has been continuous but which becomes permanent on the Cross. It does not detract from His glory to find that He grew in the knowledge of men (*ἐγίνωσκε*, ii. 25). It was part of His humiliation to be limited in certain points where His Divinity touched His human nature. There were certain moral qualities, such as obedience and patience, faith and sympathy, necessary for the discharge of His function as the High Priest of humanity. And the Word attained these through the moral discipline of an experience like our own. And out of this conflict the faith of the disciples is slowly but gradually developed. The writer's own love for his Master makes him anxious. And this personal solicitude for the Master's safety and success becomes ours too, until the sense of absolute attainment helps us also to "see and believe."

Christ ist erstanden,
 Selig der Liebende,
 Der die betrübende
 Heilsam' und übende
 Prüfung bestanden.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

*LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE BOOK OF
 ECCLESIASTICUS.*

THE Prologue. *Let me intreat you to read it with favour and attention.*

Compare George Eliot's description of Adam Bede, in the fifty-first chapter of the novel :—

On some mornings, when he read in the Apocrypha, of which he was very fond, the son of Sirach's keen-edged words would bring a delighted smile, though he also enjoyed the freedom of occasionally differing from an Apocryphal writer.

The Prologue. *When as therefore the first Jesus died,*

leaving this book almost perfected, Sirach his son receiving it after him left it to his own son Jesus, who, having gotten it into his hands, compiled it all orderly into one volume, and called it wisdom.

In the introduction to his lay sermon, Coleridge, after observing that “the inspired poets, historians, and sententiaries of the Jews are the clearest teachers of political economy; in short, that their writings are the statesman’s best manual,” adds:—

to which I should be tempted with the late Edmund Burke to annex that treasure of prudential wisdom, the Ecclesiasticus. I not only yield, however, to the authority of our church, but reverence the judgment of its founders in separating this work from the list of the Canonical Books, and in refusing to apply it to the establishment of any doctrine, while they counsel it to be “read for example of life and instruction of manners.” Excellent, nay, invaluable, as this book is in the place assigned to it by our Church, that place is justified on the clearest grounds. For not to say that the compiler himself candidly cautions us against the imperfections of his translation, and its no small difference from the original Hebrew, as it was written by his grandfather, he so expresses himself in his prologue as to exclude all claims to inspiration or divine authority in any other or higher sense than every writer is entitled to make who, having qualified himself by the careful study of the books of other men, had been drawn on to write something himself. But of still greater weight, practically, are the objections derived . . . from the prudential spirit of the maxims in general, in which prudence is taught too much on its own grounds instead of being recommended as the organ or vehicle of a spiritual principle in its existing worldly relations. In short, prudence ceases to be wisdom when it is not to the filial fear of God, and to the sense of the excellence of the divine laws, what the body is to the soul! Now, in the work of the son of Sirach, prudence is both body and soul.

It were perhaps to be wished that this work, and the Wisdom of Solomon, had alone received the honour of being accompaniments to the inspired writings, and that these should, with a short precautionary preface and a few notes, have been printed in all our Bibles.

The Prologue. *They that have learning must be able to profit them which are without, both by speaking and writing.*

Compare Hamerton's paragraphs upon the duty of intellectual charities, in his *Intellectual Life* (pp. 350 f.) :—

We to whom the rich inheritance of intellectual humanity is so familiar as to have lost much of its freshness, are liable to under-rate the value of thoughts and discoveries which to us have for years seemed commonplace. It is with our intellectual as with our material wealth ; we do not realize how precious some fragments of it might be to our poorer neighbours. The old clothes that we wear no longer may give comfort and confidence to a man in naked destitution ; the truths which are so familiar to us that we never think about them, may raise the utterly ignorant to a sense of their human brotherhood.

i. 22. *A furious man cannot be justified ; for the sway of his fury shall be his destruction.*

Pride is undoubtedly the original of anger [says Johnson in *The Rambler* (number. 11)] ; but pride, like every other passion, if it once breaks loose from reason, counteracts its own purposes. A passionate man, upon the review of his day, will have few gratifications to offer to his pride, when he has considered how his outrages were caused, why they were borne, and in what they are likely to end at last. Those sudden bursts of rage generally break out upon small occasions ; for life, unhappy as it is, cannot supply great evils as frequently as the man of fire thinks it fit to be enraged.

ii. 5. *For gold is tried in the fire, and acceptable men in the furnace of humiliation.*

There are a few characters [says Macaulay] which have stood the closest scrutiny and the severest tests, which have been tried in the furnace and found pure, which have been weighed in the balance and not found wanting, which have been declared sterling by the general consent of mankind, and which are visibly stamped with the image and superscription of the Most High. These great men we trust that we know how to prize, and of these was Milton.

ii. 10. *Look at the generations of old, and see : who did ever put his trust in the Lord and was ashamed ? or who did abide in his fear, and was forsaken ?*

One day, after I had been so many weeks oppressed and cast down therewith, as I was now quite giving up the ghost of all my hopes of ever attaining life, that sentence fell with weight upon my spirit : *Look at the generations of old and see ; did ever any trust in God and were confounded ?* At which I was greatly enlightened

and encouraged in my soul ; for thus, at that very instant, it was expounded to me, Begin at the beginning of Genesis and read to the end of the Revelations, and see if you can find that there was any that ever trusted in the Lord and was confounded. . . . Well, I looked but found it not ; only it abode upon me. Then did I ask first this good man, and then another, if they knew where it was, but they knew no such place. At this I wondered that such a sentence should so suddenly, and with such comfort and strength, seize and abide upon my heart, and yet that none could find it. For I doubted not but it was in holy Scripture. Thus I continued above a year, and could not find the place ; but at last, casting my eye into the Apocrypha books, I found it in Ecclesiasticus. This, at the first, did somewhat daunt me ; but because, by this time, I had got more experience of the love and kindness of God, it troubled me the less ; especially when I considered that, though it was not in those texts that we call holy and canonical, yet forasmuch as this sentence was the sum and substance of many of the promises, it was my duty to take the comfort of it. And I bless God for that word, for it was of God to me. That word doth still, at times, shine before my face.—BUNYAN : *Grace Abounding*, 62-65.

ii. 12-13. *Woe unto fearful hearts, and to faint hands, and to the sinner that goeth two ways ! Woe unto the faint heart ! for it believeth not ; therefore it shall not be defended.*

How are we to overcome temptations ? Cheerfulness is the first thing, cheerfulness the second, and cheerfulness the third. . . . We must be of good courage. The power of temptation is in the fainting of our own hearts.—F. W. FABER : *Growth in Holiness*, pp. 98-99.

ii. 14. *Woe unto you that have lost your patience ! and what will ye do when the Lord shall visit you ?*

He that is afraid of pain, is afraid of his own nature ; and if his fear be violent, it is a sign his patience is none at all, and an impatient person is not ready-dressed for heaven. . . . “Woe be to the man who hath lost patience ; for what will he do when the Lord shall visit him ?”—JEREMY TAYLOR : *Holy Dying*, ch. iii.

iii. 6-7, 12-13. *He that is obedient to the Lord shall be a comfort to his mother. He that feareth the Lord will honour his father, and will do service unto his parents, as to his masters. My son, help thy father in his age, and grieve him*

not as long as he liveth. And if his understanding fail, have patience with him.

About the general conceptions of morals there is a practical agreement. There is no more doubt that falsehood is wrong than that a stone falls to the ground, although the first does not admit of the same ocular proof as the second. There is no greater uncertainty about the duty of obedience to parents and to the law of the land than about the properties of triangles.—JOWETT: Introduction to the *Philebus*.

iii. 21–22. *Seek not things that are too hard for thee, and search not out things that are above thy strength. The things that have been commanded thee, think thereupon.*

Jeremy Taylor, in his *Holy Living*, cites this passage as an illustration of modesty, which is

a grace of God that moderates the over-activeness and curiosity of the mind. . . . Enquire not into the secrets of God, but be content to learn thy duty according to the quality of thy person or employment.

iii. 25. *The conceit of many hath led them astray.*

Quoted by Jeremy Taylor, in his *Holy Living*, under this paragraph :—

Pretend not to more knowledge than thou hast, but be content to seem ignorant where thou art so, lest thou beest either brought to shame, or retirest into shamelessness.

iii. 26. *A stubborn heart shall fare evil at the last ; and he that loveth danger shall perish therein.*

It is a question [says Fénelon in one of his Letters to Men] of diminishing frequent intercourse with vain women, who only study to please ; and all other society which excites a taste for pleasure, tends to throw contempt on piety, and encourage a perilous dissipation. Such society is most harmful even to men who are established in good ways, and naturally much more to a man who is only taking his first steps in a right direction, and whose naturally easy disposition inclines him to go wrong. . . . Should not your repentance bear fruit in humiliation and self-restraint as to contagious society ? “He that loveth danger shall perish therein,” the wise man says. Cost what it may, you must avoid the occasions of sin.

iv. 17-18. *At the first she will walk with him in crooked ways, and will bring fear and dread upon him, and torment him with her discipline, until she may trust his soul, and try him by her judgments ; then will she return again the straight way unto him, and will gladden him, and reveal to him her secrets.*

Certainly we need a clue into the labyrinth which is to lead us to Him ; and who among us can hope to seize upon the true starting-points of thought for that enterprise, and upon all of them, who is to understand their right direction, to follow them out to their just limits, and duly to estimate, adjust, and combine the various reasonings in which they issue, so as safely to arrive at what is worth any labour to secure, without a special illumination from Himself ? Such are the dealings of wisdom with the elect soul. "She will bring upon him fear, and dread, and trial ; and She will torture him with the tribulation of her discipline, till she try him by her Laws, and trust his soul. Then She will strengthen him, and make Her way straight to him, and give him joy."—NEWMAN, *Grammar of Assent*, ch. ix.

Its general tone is worthy of that first contact between the two great civilizations of the ancient world, and breathes a spirit which an Isaiah would not have condemned, nor a Sophocles or a Theophrastus have despised. There is not a word in it to countenance the minute casuistries of the later Rabbis, or the metaphysical subtleties of the later Alexandrians. It pours out its whole strength in discussing the conduct of human life, or the direction of the soul to noble aims. Here first in the sacred books we find the full delineation of the idea of education through a slow, gradual process. "At first by crooked ways, then will she return the straight way, and comfort him, and show him her secrets."—DEAN STANLEY.

iv. 22. *Accept not the person of any against thine own soul ; and reverence no man unto thy falling.*

I feel it in my power [Keats wrote to his friend Reynolds] to refuse the poisonous suffrage of a public. My own being which I know to be becomes of more consequence to me than the crowds of Shadows in the shape of men and women that inhabit a kingdom. The soul is a world of itself, and has enough to do in its own home.

iv. 24. *For by speech wisdom shall be known, and learning by the word of the tongue.*

I have not [says St. Patrick modestly, in his *Confession*, learned, like others who have drunk in, in the best manner, both law and sacred literature . . . as can be easily proved from the drivel of my writing—how I have been instructed and learned in diction ; because the wise man says, “ For by the tongue is discerned understanding, and knowledge, and the teaching of truth.”

v. 1. *Set not thy heart upon thy goods ; and say not, I have enough for my life.*

Quaerenda pecunia primum est ; virtus post nummos. But that *post* never arrives ; at least, it did not in Rome, whatever may be the case in England. The very influx of the *nummi* retarded it, and kept *virtus* at a distance. In fact, she is of a jealous nature, and never comes at all, unless she comes in the first place. That which is a man’s *alpha* will also be his *omega* ; and, in advancing from one to the other, his velocity is mostly accelerated at every step.—JULIUS HARE, in *Guesses at Truth* (second series).

v. 4. *Say not, I sinned, and what happened unto me ?*

Compare Ariel’s warning sentence to the “ three men of sin,” in *The Tempest* (act iii. scene 3) :—

Remember

(For that’s my business to you) that you three
From Milan did supplant good Prospero ;
Exposed unto the sea, which hath requit it,
Him, and his innocent child ; for which foul deed
The Powers, delaying, not forgetting, have
Incensed the seas and shores, yea, all the creatures,
Against your peace.

v. 5–6. *Concerning propitiation, be not without fear to add sin unto sin : and say not, His mercy is great ; He will be pacified for the multitude of my sins.*

We ought to bear our sins in mind, says St. Chrysostom, for not only do we extinguish them by so doing, but we become gentler and more indulgent towards others, and we serve God with greater tenderness, having from that memory of our sins a better insight into His inestimable goodness ! Scripture tells us (Ecclus. v. 5), “ Be not without fear of a forgiven sin ” ; and indeed such a fear will be the best security against another fall.—F. W. FABER, *All for Jesus* (p. 79).

v. 11–14. *Be swift to hear, and with patience give answer.*

If thou hast understanding, answer thy neighbour ; if not, lay thy hand upon thy mouth. Honour and shame is in talk : and the tongue of man is his fall. Be not called a whisperer ; and lie not in wait with thy tongue.

It will be found [says Schopenhauer] that all who profess to instruct men in the wisdom of life are specially urgent in commending the practice of silence, and assign manifold reasons why it should be observed ; so that I need not enlarge at greater length on this point. Let me add, however, one or two unfamiliar Arab proverbs, which seem to me particularly relevant :—

Do not tell a friend anything you would hide from an enemy.

A secret is in my custody, if I keep it ; if it escapes me, it is I who am the prisoner.

The tree of silence bears the fruit of peace.

vi. 5-6. *Sweet language will multiply friends ; and a fair-speaking tongue will increase kind greetings. Be in peace with many, nevertheless have but one counsellor of a thousand.*

Speaking of friendship in the *Spectator* (68), Addison observes :—

Among the several fine things which have been spoken of it, I shall beg leave to quote some out of a very ancient author whose book would be regarded by our modern wits as one of the most shining traets of morality that is extant, if it appeared under the name of a Confucius or of any celebrated Grecian philosopher : I mean the little apocryphal treatise entitled *The Wisdom of the Son of Sirach*. How finely has he described the art of making friends, by an obliging and affable behaviour ! and laid down that precept which a late excellent author has delivered as his own, “ that we should have many well-wishers, but few friends ! ”

Addison then quotes the above verses, and continues :—

With what prudence does he caution us in the choice of our friends ? And with what strokes of nature (I could almost say of Humour) has he described the behaviour of a treacherous and self-interested friend ? *If thou wouldst get a friend, prove him first, and be not hasty to credit him : for some man is a friend for his own occasion, and will not abide in the day of thy trouble. And there is a friend who, being turned to enmity and strife, will discover thy reproach* (vi. 7-9). . . . In the next words he particualarizes one of

those fruits of friendship which is described at length by the two famous authors above-mentioned [Cicero and Bacon], and falls into a general eulogium of friendship, which is very just as well as very sublime. *A faithful friend is a strong defence ; and he that hath found such a one, hath found a treasure. Nothing doth countervail a faithful friend, and his excellency is unvaluable. A faithful friend is the medicine of life ; and they that fear the Lord shall find him* (vi. 15 f.). I do not remember to have met with any saying that has pleased me more than that a of friend's being the medicine of life, to express the efficacy of friendship in healing the pains and anguish which naturally cleave to our existence in this world.

vi. 8. *There is a friend that is so for his own occasion ; and he will not continue in the day of thine affliction.*

For 'tis a question left as yet to prove,
 Whether love lead fortune, or else fortune love.
 The great man down, you mark, his favourite flies ;
 The poor advanced makes friends of enemies.
 And hitherto doth love on fortune tend ;
 For who needs not, shall never lack a friend ;
 And who in want a hollow friend doth try,
 Directly seasons him his enemy.

—SHAKESPEARE : *Hamlet* (act iii. scene 2).

O summer-friendship,
 Whose flattering leaves, that shadow'd us in our
 Prosperity, with the least gust drop off
 In the autumn of adversity !

—MASSINGER : *The Maid of Honour* (act iii. scene 1).

vi. 10, 12. *There is a friend who is a companion at the table, and will not continue in the day of thine affliction. . . . If thou be brought low, he will be against thee, and will hide himself from thy face.*

When Fortune in her shift and change of mood
 Spurns down her late beloved, all his dependants
 Which labour'd after him to the mountain's top
 Even on their knees and hands, let him slip down,
 Not one accompanying his declining foot.

SHAKESPEARE : *Timon of Athens*, act i. scene 1.

vi. 20, 22. *She is very unpleasant to the unlearned : he that is without understanding will not remain with her. For wisdom is according to her name, and she is not manifest unto many.*

The power of liberal studies lies more hid than that it can be wrought out by profane wits. It is not every man's way to hit. Science is not every man's mistress.—JONSON: *Discoveries* (xxiii.).

vii. 6. *Seek not to be judge, lest thou be not able to take away iniquity; lest at any time thou fear the person of the mighty, and lay a stumbling-block in the way of thy uprightness.*

Compare Scott's account of Scotland in the eighteenth century, in the second chapter of *The Bride of Lammermoor*.

The administration of justice, in particular, was infected by the most gross partiality. A case of importance scarcely occurred, in which there was not some ground for bias or partiality on the part of the judges, who were so little able to withstand the temptation, that the adage, "Show me the man, and I will show you the law," became as prevalent as it was scandalous. One corruption led the way to others still more gross and profligate. The judge who lent his sacred authority in one case to support a friend, and in another to crush an enemy, and whose decisions were founded on family connexions, or political relations, could not be supposed inaccessible to direct personal motives; and the purse of the wealthy was too often believed to be thrown into the scale to weigh down the cause of the poor litigant.

JAMES MOFFATT.

*THE PHILOLOGY OF THE GREEK BIBLE: ITS
PRESENT AND FUTURE.*¹

I.

THE GREEK BIBLE AS A COMPACT UNITY. THE NEW
LINGUISTIC RECORDS.

“THE Greek Bible!”—There, in the brilliant sunshine of the south, stretched out before the student’s eye, lies the Hellenistic world as it was at the great turning-point of religious history. Alexander, the conqueror and moulder of the world, had marched with his armies towards the rising sun, bearing with him the spirit of the Greek race, and round about the Mediterranean basin the seeds of a world-wide Greek civilization had been planted in the ancient soil. In the State and in society, in science and art, in language and religion, the Mediterranean world was in process of more or less vigorous Hellenization and consequent levelling towards uniformity.

About this time, say at the end of the second or beginning of the first century B.C., it happened that two Jewish girls named Heraclea and Marthina, were murdered in the island of Delos. Their innocent blood cried aloud for vengeance, but the murderers were unknown. On the Great Day of Atonement, therefore, the relatives made their petition to

¹ These lectures were delivered in the Summer School of the Free Churches, at Cambridge, in July and August, 1907. In writing them I allowed myself the use of part of an address given by me at Giessen in 1897. The lectures were translated for me by Mr. Lionel R. M. Strachan, M.A., Lector of English in the University of Heidelberg.

the God of their fathers. With fervent prayers they consigned the cruel murderers to the vengeance of God and His angels, and their imprecations were immortalized on marble tablets above the graves where the murdered girls lay buried in the island of Rheneia, which was the cemetery of Delos.

The original text of these Jewish prayers for vengeance, found at Rheneia¹ and now preserved at Athens and Bucharest, shows us the Jews of Delos about the year 100 B.C., in possession of the Greek Old Testament. This single picture is typical. The Old Testament, as you know, had been translated from Hebrew into Greek at different times and by different persons in Egypt, beginning in the third century B.C., and the complete version is known as the Septuagint. We see then that by 100 B.C. the Septuagint Bible had already found its way from its home on the Nile to the remoter Jews of the Dispersion—a book from the Hellenistic world for the Hellenistic world.

It is true that in spirit it was an Eastern book, but as regards form and subject matter it was adapted to the needs of the Western world; it was a book both of the East and the West.² It was not a book according to the professional ideas of the artistic literature of that age, for it was not clad in the garb of the literary language. But it was a book for the People; for on the whole, though in many passages that would seem strange to the Greeks it did not conceal the peculiarity of the original text, it spoke the colloquial language of the middle and lower class, as is shown especially clearly by its vocabulary and accidentence. Here and there, less in some of the single books and more in others, it was

¹ Cf. my essay, "Die Rachegebete von Rheneia," in *Philogogus*, lxi. New Series, xv. (1902), pp. 252-265; reprinted in my forthcoming book *Licht vom Osten*, Tübingen, 1908.

² Cf. my little sketch *Die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus*, Leipzig, 1903.

unintelligible to the men of the Hellenistic world ; but taken as a whole it must not be dismissed with the hasty criticism that it was an unintelligible book. Such criticism is the result of looking at the artistic Attic prose instead of at the contemporary popular language. Taken as a whole the Septuagint became emphatically a popular book—we may even say a universal book.

If the historical importance of things is to be estimated by their historical effects, how paltry must, for example, the History of Polybius appear beside the Septuagint Bible ! Of all pre-Christian Greek literature Homer alone is comparable with this Bible in historical influence, and Homer, in spite of his enormous popularity, was never a Bible. Take the Septuagint in your hand, and you have before you the book that was the Bible of the Jews of the Dispersion and of the proselytes from the heathen ; the Bible of Philo the philosopher, Paul the Apostle, and the earliest Christian missions ; the Bible of the whole Greek-speaking Christian world ; the mother of influential daughter-versions ; the mother of the Greek New Testament.

But is that true ? Is the Septuagint really the mother of the Greek New Testament ? It seems a bold statement to make, but it is not difficult to show what I mean by it.

The Septuagint was not necessary for the coming of the Lord Jesus. The Semitic, not the Greek, Old Testament was a constituent factor in His Gospel. The historical Jesus of Nazareth takes His stand firmly on the non-Greek Old Testament. But Paul, the preacher and propagator of the Gospel, is not comprehensible without the Septuagint. He is not only the great Christ-Christian but also the great Septuagint-Christian. And the whole of Primitive Christianity, so far as it is missionary Christianity, rests on the Lord and the Gospels as one pillar, and on the Septuagint Bible as the other. Through the Pauline Epistles and all

the other earliest Christian writings the words of the Septuagint run like veins of silver.

We shall not, however, speak of the Septuagint as the mother of the New Testament in the sense that without it the separate parts of the New Testament would not have been written. They arose as echoes of the prophecies of Jesus and as the reflex of His personality. But in respect to their contents they are immensely indebted to the Septuagint Bible, and—this is for us the matter of most importance—the parts would never have grown into the New Testament as a whole—the Canon—but for the Septuagint. The Old Greek Canon of Scripture is presupposed by the New. The history of religion displays the marvellous spectacle of the Old Bible, encircled by the apparently unscalable walls of the Canon, opening wide her gates and admitting a New Bible to the sacred precinct : the Saviour and His disciples take their places by Moses and the prophets. This cohesion between the New Testament and the Old was historically possible only because the Old Testament by its Hellenization had become assimilated in advance to the future New Testament.

The daughter belongs of right to the mother ; the Greek Old and New Testament form by their contents and by their fortunes an inseparable unity. The oldest manuscript Bibles that we possess are complete Bibles in Greek. But what history has joined together, doctrine has put asunder ; the Greek Bible has been torn in halves. On the table of our theological students you will generally see the Hebrew Old Testament lying side by side with the Greek New Testament. It is one of the most painful deficiencies of Biblical study at the present day that the reading of the Septuagint has been pushed into the background, while its exegesis has been scarcely even begun.

All honour to the Hebrew original ! But the proverbial

Novum in Vetere latet cannot be fully understood without a knowledge of the Septuagint. A single hour lovingly devoted to the text of the Septuagint will further our exegetical knowledge of the Pauline Epistles more than a whole day spent over a commentary.

We must read the Septuagint as a Greek text and as a book of the people, just as the Jew of the Dispersion would have done who knew no Hebrew, and as the converted heathen of the first and second century would have read it. Every reader of the Septuagint who knows his Greek Testament will after a few days' study come to see with astonishment what hundreds of threads there are uniting the Old and the New. By underlining all the parallels and reciprocally illustrative passages it is easy to render this impression concrete and permanent.

Many pages there are which we shall be able to read without difficulty. Then, it is true, we shall meet with obscurities here and there, peculiarities and rare words, where our lexicons give us no real information. For the present let us simply pass over whatever is doubtful. After all the total impression will not be, "Here is a book unintelligible to a Greek but containing some things that he could understand," but, "Here is a text intelligible to him as a whole but with some obscurities." These obscurities did not prevent the Septuagint from influencing the Graeco-Jewish and Graeco-Christian world, and even to-day only pedants will be deterred by them from reading the Septuagint.

He who does read, however, will be amply rewarded. An empty abstraction will have acquired reality; a forgotten Bible will have been rediscovered; a sacred relic, buried in sand and dust and unobserved by hundreds of passers by, will have attracted the pious eye for which it waited. And that eye perceives that the re-discovered Septuagint is the

sanctuary leading to the Holy of Holies, namely the New Testament, and that both together make up the one great temple, the Bible.

This connexion between the two Greek Testaments will be recognized more and more with the progress of scientific research. In the study of Hellenistic civilization, i.e., the civilization of the Hellenistic world of the Mediterranean in the post-Alexandrian and Imperial ages, a study which has developed so enormously during the last twenty or thirty years, it will be more and more clearly recognized that amid the vast mass of witnesses to that civilization the Greek Bible (Old and New Testament) is the chief.

It deserves to be so regarded not only for the special character of its form and contents, betokening as they do a union of the Eastern with the Western spirit altogether remarkable in the history of the world, but also on account of the mighty influence it exerted. To see things in their true historical perspective we must place the Greek Bible in the midst of the other witnesses to the contemporary Hellenistic world. This restoration of the Greek Bible to its own epoch is really the distinctive feature of the work of modern Bible scholarship ; and by utilizing the newly discovered texts of the Hellenistic age fresh vigour has been infused into Bible scholarship, reviving and rejuvenating that somewhat torpid and inactive organism.

What are these newly discovered texts ? Your thoughts fly at first perhaps to newly found books or fragments of ancient authors. But valuable though these discoveries are, the chief importance attaches to the non-literary texts, especially those on stone, papyrus, and fragments of pottery, which have been brought to light in their thousands and ten-thousands. The inscriptions, papyri, and potsherds form a great storehouse of exact information, from which

Biblical research has recently drawn as rich supplies as any other branch of the science of antiquities.

The *Inscriptions* are found in astonishing numbers on the site of the ancient seats of civilization on the shores of the Mediterranean, either in their original positions or lying under ruins and mounds of rubbish. In the latter case they have to be excavated, and some of them find a home in our museums. They are rendered accessible by publication in great cyclopaedic works, the two largest of which are the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* and the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, the latter gradually replacing the older and now obsolete *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*.

The period of the discovery of new inscriptions is by no means ended. The researches and excavations of the European and American archaeological institutes, and the archaeological expeditions sent out by various states or by private individuals, bring to light innumerable inscribed stones year by year. To these agencies we must add the engineering enterprises for opening up the old Mediterranean countries to modern industry and commerce, which are not always harmful but in many cases helpful to the study of antiquities.

A particularly interesting example of an unexpected find came under my notice in the spring of 1906. My friend Theodor Wiegand showed me among the extensive ruins of ancient Miletus, now being excavated by him, the remains of a temple of Apollo Delphinios, the paving stones of which consisted chiefly of highly important ancient documents in stone. The encroachments of the surface water had at some period made it necessary to raise the level of the floor, and to effect this a number of old inscribed slabs had been laid face downwards on the original marble pavement. By turning them up Wiegand had discovered quite a collection of entirely new inscriptions,

which may be described as a sort of ancient Milesian archives.

The student of the Greek Bible is of course most interested in the inscriptions found in Egypt, the country that gave birth to the Septuagint, and in the centres of early Christianity, i.e., Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece. At the present moment excavations are in progress that are certainly full of promise in this direction, not only at Miletus and at Didyma, where the oracle of Miletus was situated, but also at Ephesus, Pergamos, and Corinth. The total wealth of the epigraphical material from the oldest seats of Greek Christianity will be appreciated when the great Corpus of the Inscriptions of Asia Minor as planned by the Austrian archaeologists is completed. Some conception of it can be formed even now by reading the books of Sir William Ramsay¹ or by studying the inscriptions of a single small town, such as those of Magnesia on the Maeander, published by Otto Kern,² or those of Priene by Hiller von Gaertringen.³

Neither in form nor in subject-matter do the inscriptions make a uniform group. When they are of official origin, the work of kings, emperors, high dignitaries, civic authorities, they are usually very carefully expressed and written in literary Greek. When they are the work of private indivi-

¹ Works by Sir William Mitchell Ramsay :—*The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*, London, 1893 ; 7th ed., 1903. *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Oxford, 1895. *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895 ; 3rd ed., 1897. *Was Christ born at Bethlehem ? A Study on the Credibility of St. Luke*, London, 1898. *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, London, 1899. *The Education of Christ*, London, 1902. *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, London, 1904. *Pauline and other Studies in Early Christian History*, London, 1906. *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire*, London, 1906.

² *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, herausgegeben von Otto Kern, Berlin, 1900.

³ *Inschriften von Priene*, herausgegeben von F. Frhr. Hiller von Gaertringen, Berlin, 1906.

duals they are not infrequently done rather carelessly and are more or less specimens of the colloquial language. This is particularly the case with the private inscriptions of the Roman Imperial period, which for this reason are valuable for Biblical purposes, since the Greek Bible itself is for the most part a monument of the spoken, not of the written language. The inscriptions are fruitful to Biblical philology chiefly from the lexical point of view.

These epigraphical remains of antiquity have for centuries attracted the attention of scholars, and Biblical exegesis has turned them to account since the end of the eighteenth century. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century they were reinforced by a large new group of texts written on what would seem to be a most perishable material, viz., the *Papyri*.

Suppose that in the course of casual excavations in a mound of absolutely dry sand we were to find to-day whole bundles of original private letters, contracts, wills, records of judicial proceedings, and government documents, emanating from our ancestors of the tenth century A.D.,—the whole of the learned world would be interested in the discovery. How few original letters, for example, written by humble individuals have come down to us from the olden time. The record of history has taken notice only of the great. The scanty memorials of the common people are found scattered here and there—on a weathered tombstone, maybe, or noted by chance in the reports of legal cases or in the account-books of towns or shires.

So was it formerly with our knowledge of antiquity. In so far as it was based on literary tradition it was, roughly speaking, the history of great things, the history of nations and their leaders in politics, learning, art, and religion. Records of humble life, written memorials of the masses, were wanting. At best we caught glimpses of such insignificant

persons in the comedies and some other literary works, but then they were seen in the light thrown on them by their social superiors. And so far as the tradition was non-literary, the upper classes again took the lion's share, for the majority of the inscriptions come from the privileged powerful and cultured class.

The discoveries of papyri have made good this deficiency in a most unexpected manner. Though they, too, throw a flood of light on the upper, cultivated class, yet in innumerable cases these scraps of papyrus are records of the middle and lower classes. They possess for the study of antiquity the same eminent degree of importance as that sandhill we imagined just now—alas that it is undiscoverable!—would possess for our own earlier history if it contained original letters of the tenth century.

It is owing to the Egyptian climate that such mounds exist beside the Nile. On the outskirts of ancient Egyptian towns and villages there were, as in our towns, places where rubbish and refuse might be deposited. Whole bundles of old time-expired official documents, instead of being burnt or otherwise destroyed, were cast out by the authorities on these rubbish heaps. Private persons did the same when clearing out their accumulations of old and therefore worthless written matter. The reverence of mankind in antiquity for writing of any kind may have been a reason for rejecting the more convenient method of destruction by fire. The centuries have covered these rubbish heaps with thick layers of dust and sand, which, in conjunction with the dryness of the climate, have preserved even papyrus most admirably.

Egyptian peasants, digging in these mounds for earth to manure their fields with, were the first chance discoverers of ancient papyri. The news of such discoveries first reached Europe in the eighteenth century ; the nineteenth

witnessed the gradual arrival here and there of a small number of papyri in the European museums. There they were looked upon as curiosities until in the last quarter of the century the great and astounding discoveries began.

These discoveries immediately led to systematic searches, and even excavations ; and here it is chiefly British investigators who have done the greatest service in enlarging and publishing our store of papyri. Flinders Petrie¹ has recovered magnificent old specimens, particularly from mummy-wrappings, which were made by sticking sheets of papyrus together. Grenfell and Hunt,² the Dioscuri of research, have carried out epoch-making excavations at Oxyrhynchus and other places, and have published their treasures with astonishing promptitude and masterly accuracy.

Thus during the last twenty years a new science, Papyrology, has grown up and has undergone division into numerous branches according to the various languages in which the documents are written. The oldest documents, going back to more than 3,000 B.C., fall within the province of Egyptology. There are also Aramaic papyri, and great interest has been aroused by those of the fifth century B.C., which were recently³ published by Sayce and Cowley.

¹ Cf. J. P. Mahaffy, *On the Flinders Petrie Papyri*. With transcriptions, commentaries, and index. Royal Irish Academy, Cunningham Memoirs, 1891, vol. ii. 1893.

² By B. P. Grenfell:—*An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment, and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic*, Oxford, 1896. By B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt:—*New Classical Fragments, and other Greek and Latin Papyri*, Oxford, 1897. *Λογία Ἰησοῦ* . . . From an early Greek Papyrus, London, 1897. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, London, 1898–1904. *Fayûm Towns and their Papyri* (with D. G. Hogarth), London, 1900. *The Amherst Papyri*, London, 1900–1901. *The Tebtunis Papyri*, London, 1902–7. *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus*, London, 1904. *The Hibeh Papyri*, London, 1906.

³ A. H. Sayce and A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri discovered at Assuan*. With appendices by W. Spiegelberg and Seymour de Ricci. London, 1906 (pp. 79 ; 27 plates).

With the fourth century B.C. begins the main body of the papyri. Greek documents, of the most various contents, they run through the whole Ptolemaic period—i.e., for us the period of the origin of the Greek Old Testament ; they run on through the earliest Imperial period—i.e., for us the period of the origin of the New Testament ; they continue from the second to the fourth century, A.D.—i.e., for us the age of the persecutions ; and finally they extend over another five hundred years of Christian Byzantine civilization. Together with them are found also a number of Latin papyri ; in the later periods numerous fragments in Coptic, Arabic, Hebrew, Persian, and other languages.

The great published collections of these treasures confront us like some high mountain that has just been discovered, and from whose summit we shall be able to see farther than ever our ancestors could ; but we have not yet climbed one tenth part of the ascent. Papyrological students have found a rallying-point in the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, a journal founded by the greatest of German papyrologists, Ulrich Wilcken.¹

Students of the Greek Bible are indebted principally to the Greek papyri for additions to their knowledge. There are of course numerous fragments of Biblical and early Christian manuscripts, but of these I do not intend to speak here. I am concerned with the non-Christian texts. They are not a uniform group. Side by side with documents of the lower and middle class we find also—and in the pre-Christian period find most commonly—official texts written in official style and in the unvarying language of legal formularies. Even these afford us deep insight into the civilization of their time. But freshest and most direct

¹ *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete*, hrsg. von U. Wilcken, Leipzig, 1900, etc.

in their appeal are those written in the colloquial language, often in the crudest of vulgar Greek. Here truly are the great storerooms from which Biblical philology draws its new knowledge.

Still more "vulgar" are the texts newly discovered on the *Ostraca*. The ostrakon or potsherd, obtainable from any broken jug or vessel, was the writing material of the poor, a favourite even with the authorities in their dealings with the poorer classes, and used especially often for tax-receipts. Formerly almost unnoticed and even despised by investigators, the ostraca have now attained a place of honour—thanks especially to the labours of Wilcken¹ on the Greek, and of Crum² on the Coptic ostraca—and large collections of them have been rapidly formed in the European museums. In 1819 an architect named Gau, who was working at Dakkeh in Nubia, threw away nearly all the ostraca he found there as worthless rubbish, but nowadays these little texts are properly respected. Only the dealers in antiquities have not yet learnt to set a high value on them. A short text written on an ostrakon would cost twenty times as much if it were on papyrus, though there is no difference in the historical value of its contents.

The number of Biblical fragments on ostraca is not large at present. The most important find hitherto consists of twenty ostraca from Upper Egypt, some large and some small, with fragments from the Gospels.

But the ostraca, like the papyri, possess a greater indirect value. As linguistic memorials of the lower classes these humble potsherd texts shed light on many a detail of the

¹ U. Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1899 (2 vols.).

² Coptic Ostraca from the collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and others. The texts edited with translations and commentaries by W. E. Crum, London, 1902.

linguistic character of our sacred Book—that Book which was written not by learned men but by simple folk, by men who themselves confessed that they had their treasure in earthen vessels (2 Cor. iv. 7). And thus the modest ostraca rank as of equal value with the papyri and inscriptions.

In the following lectures we shall have to speak of the great changes which Biblical philology has undergone as a consequence of the employment of these texts. But I may say here that the autograph evidence of the world contemporary with the Greek Bible helps us to understand that Bible not only linguistically, but also in other ways. The most important thing of all perhaps is that we become better acquainted with the bright and dark side of the men to whom were addressed the propaganda of cosmopolitan Graeco-Judaism and the missions of cosmopolitan Christianity, and that we thus learn to judge more justly of both the contact and the contrast in which Primitive Christianity stood with the surrounding world.

ADOLF DEISSMANN.

A CHRISTIAN CITY IN THE BYZANTINE AGE.

II.

I HAVE first of all to correct an error in the former part of this article, due ultimately to a misprint in Labbe's edition of the *Acta Conciliorum*. The name Barathra does not occur in any ancient authority, only Barata, Baratta and Barattha (together with some false forms, which may be ignored as mere errors). In Labbe's Nicene lists, A.D. 325, either a broken letter *t*, or a misprint *r* in place of *t*, causes the name to appear Barathra (unless it is minutely inspected); and thus it is given in the classified lists printed in my *Historical Geography*, p. 331. The form Barathe in the Pentinger Table, therefore, seemed to prove that Barathra occurred in the original map from which the Table ultimately was derived. This idea must now be abandoned: Barathe implies an original Barattha. The identification of Maden Sheher as Barata, therefore, rests only on the general arguments stated in my study of Lycaonian topography, in the Austrian *Jahreshefte*, 1904, *Beibl.*, p. 82, which though strong are not conclusive. It remains quite possible that the old name Barata (pronounced, at least in later Roman time, Varata) is to be regarded as identical with the modern Varta, Abyss, and that Maden-Sheher is the Turkish translation of the ancient name. But this philological theory cannot be used as an argument at present to support the topographical identification; rather, the philological theory needs to be supported on the topographical fact.

In the concluding paragraph the relation between the churches of the Kara-Dagh (Barata) and graves of the dead was introduced, and it was pointed out that these churches show how the old Anatolian belief, that no place was properly consecrated unless a grave were connected

with it, and that the making of a grave was in itself an act of religious worship, was revived in a slightly Christianized form.

In the first place the mere fact that in a small district we have at least sixty churches, and probably others either undiscovered or obliterated, shows that these churches were not used only for purposes of Christian assembly and congregational ritual. Moreover, a number of them are too small. The mere building of a church must have been in itself felt as an act of religious duty and merit.

In the second place, as my wife began first to observe, there is a marked tendency to have beside each church (apart from those actually inside the circuit of the town-dwellings) a grave and a basin cut in the rock for holding water. Cases of this class are too many to enumerate. They are the general feature of the locality.

In the third place, a grave is sometimes found in the vestibule or narthex of the church.

In the fourth place, we very often found a sepulchral inscription engraved in a conspicuous way on a church, most frequently on one of the doorposts or on a supporting column in the middle of the double doorway. It is impossible to suppose that such inscriptions, placed so conspicuously, were unauthorized or unconnected with the purpose of the construction. Perhaps it might forthwith be assumed that these inscriptions state the intention and character of the building; but in view of all that depends on this principle it is best that reasons should be stated, in case there be any reluctance to admit the view which is here set forth. When I first observed these sepulchral inscriptions on the churches, I thought they had been placed on the buildings, after they had stood for years, from the desire to bury the dead close to the holy shrine; but I found that this view does not explain the facts.

Now these sepulchral inscriptions on churches at or near Barata are all very late. They are engraved in coarse, rude letters, and their whole style marks them as later than anything else of the kind known to me in Anatolian epigraphy. Some examples will show clearly that they are of the poorest and least educated style.

1. On the apse of Church No. III. in Bin Bir Kilisse—

Here lies the daughter of Stephanus, who never felt sensation or pleasure, on the tenth November.¹

It can hardly be supposed that, in epitaphs so brief as these, the description of the child implies only that she died too young to speak: that could have been expressed by stating her age. She had been a witless child, who never shared in the pleasure or intercourse of life²; and this fact is stated, evidently, as part of the reason why special attention was paid to her grave: on this point there will be more to say in a subsequent paragraph.

The adjoining stone bears an extract from Psalm cxxxii. 14,³ written by the same hand as a sort of consecration of the church in a higher religious style. These two inscriptions are like the dedication and the consecrating words of Scripture, engraved on the two sides of the entrance to a rock-church at Siniandos.⁴

2. On the middle column in the west door of church No. VI. at Bin Bir Kilisse—

Theodoros, the slave of Christ. (Here) was laid to rest Papadia in the month of March on the fifteenth. Amen. God give her bliss.

¹ This and the other epitaphs are complete, unless the contrary is stated. The Greek text of all is given at the end of the article.

² Hence she was nameless, probably unbaptized (M. Clermont Ganneau).

³ Mr. C. H. Turner pointed out to me that it was an inaccurate quotation of this Psalm: hence it is necessary to take *κατωκύσω* as equivalent to *κατοικήσω*.

⁴ The inscriptions are given by Rev. H. S. Cronin in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1902, pp. 97, 339. In 2 *ἰσέλθομεν . . . ἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ κ(υρίου)ν ψάλλοντες ψαλμῶς*. In 1 *ἀθλοφθ[ρ]ου κέ παν[ελεήμο?]νος κέ παναμ[ώμο]ν κέ παναγίας*. I copied them in 1905.

In all probability Theodore was father of Papadia, who in that case was unmarried.

3. On the side of the entrance to a small chapel built on to church No. XXI. at Bin Bir Kilisse—

(Here) was laid to rest the Domestikos on May fourth.

The Domestikos was one of the highest officers in the Byzantine army; and probably Barata produced only one person who ever attained that rank. Hence his name is omitted as being familiar to all readers of the epitaph. He probably belonged to the ninth or tenth century, when the Saracen raids were being repelled from Anatolia. There can be no doubt that this chapel was his memorial.

4. On the middle column in the west door of church No. I. at Bin Bir Kilisse—

Here lies Mousianou, (son of) George

Other words or names follow which I cannot understand; yet the letters are clearly legible; the engraver must have erred.

5. On the middle column in the west door of church No. V. at Bin Bir Kilisse—

Here lies the blessed Chionia in the month of Pephruary.¹

The inscriptions, which are dated only by the month without the year, show a low standard of chronology. The date by indiction, though it is a bad system, shows a distinctly higher standard, and points to an earlier period and better education. Hence the two following, which are evidently companion epitaphs, must be placed earlier than those which mention only the month.

¹ This may serve as a specimen of the spelling in these late inscriptions: it indicates a very rude pronunciation of the Greek language.

It may be doubted whether the epithet *μακάριος*, applied to Chionia in 5, had at this late period any other meaning than "deceased"; and perhaps it may be taken as indicative of sympathy and pity for an untimely death. In older inscriptions, as for example *Studies in the History of the Eastern Provinces*, p. 22, *μακάριος* carried more connotation in an epitaph.

6. On a stone in the west front of church No. II. at Deghile at the south corner—

Here lies Philaretos son of Akylas : I died in the war on thirtieth May, indiction the fourth.

The war was doubtless the war against the Arabs, which lasted for nearly three centuries from about 670.

7. On a stone beside the last in the same course of the west front of church No. II. at Deghile—

Here lies Akylas : he died on eleventh April, indiction the tenth.

It is to be presumed that the church was built by Akylas in memory of his son, and that the father himself was afterwards buried beside his son. The epitaph of the latter is on the corner-stone in the place of honour, but still not in such a conspicuous position as 2-5.

A noteworthy fact is that the older epitaphs give more information and are more individualized than the later. Even the following must be regarded as older than 2-5, which are of the latest and worst class.

8. On the south wall of church No. VII. at Deghile—

Here lies Paul : he died on the third of April.

The addition of the verb "he died" raises this above the level of 2-5; and, in fact, the church of Paul was probably among the earliest of this late class of churches.

Considering the conspicuous position in the building occupied by all these inscriptions, we must suppose that they had some connexion with the construction. At first I thought that they might have been engraved on the completed churches as a special honour permitted by the ecclesiastical authorities, or even on the buildings after they had fallen into ruins. But both these hypotheses seem unacceptable. So long as there was a Christian population in Barata, it cannot be supposed that the churches, even though ruined, lost their sanctity in the popular eye so completely that the pillars of the doorways

could be used as chance gravestones. The churches were and remained to the end holy places, and could never have been used without permission as cemeteries, and neither graffitti nor unauthorized epitaphs can be supposed to have been placed so conspicuously on them.

Nor is it a sufficient explanation of the facts to say that there was a strong popular desire to be buried in holy ground, and that the right to be buried in the doorway of the church as the most honourable place was granted as a compliment or for money. We have found no proof of the western habit of making graves in the churches and of surrounding the churches with graves close up to the walls, and covering the walls with sepulchral inscriptions. In some cases, as No. VII. at Maden-Sheher and I. at Deghile, churches were built in the midst of or close to cemeteries already existing; but here the graves are, in my opinion, older (as is certain in regard to some of them, but cannot be proved in every case). There is one sepulchral inscription in each of those late churches, and no more;¹ and this one is placed in a specially conspicuous position.

Nor is it a sufficient explanation to suppose that this right was granted to certain distinguished persons as a mark of special respect and honour. The persons commemorated are not those who had won a high position or rendered services to the church or the state. One is an idiot child, others are young women in all probability unmarried.² It seems probable that, just as in ancient Athens the loutrophoros vase of the marriage ceremonial was placed on the grave of a girl who died unmarried, so here the church-burial is a sort of compensation in the

¹ I except certain older inscribed stones which were taken and put into the walls when they were building: the inscriptions being more or less defaced: see *Studies in the History of the Eastern Provinces*, p. 262.

² The husband would probably be mentioned, if they were married.

world of death for misfortune in life or untimely death. One person alone is distinguished, the Domesticus; and in his case it is on other grounds quite certain that the church at the door of which he was buried was his sepulchral monument. The Domesticus was laid to rest in a small memorial church of cruciform shape which was attached as a sort of chapel to the north side of the large church No. XXI.

The whole series of churches bearing these inscriptions, therefore, seem to have been built as memorials of the dead.

Now compare this class of church inscriptions with a different class, in better style of writing and spelling.

9. On the front of the same door-pillar in No. VI., which has inscription 2 on its side,

Through the vow of Teucer, son of Papias.

10. At the west door of the same church, No. VI., in which are inscriptions 2 and 9, on the stone at the left side from which springs the left arch of the double doorway,

Through the vow of Nesius, son of Tiberius.

11. In the same church, No. VI., over the door leading from the narthex into the church proper,

Through the vow of Mammas the trib(une).

No epigraphist would hesitate for a moment to place inscriptions 9-11 much earlier than 2;¹ yet they are on

¹ They are engraved and spelt in a superior style; and the names suit best with a comparatively early date. Teucer never passed into Christian nomenclature, and we should not be inclined to believe that it was used much, if at all, later than the fifth century. The other names in 9-11 were all adopted as Christian, but Nesius is found in the Episcopal lists only A.D. 431, and Mammas, though found in A.D. 692, was far commoner in the councils of the fifth and sixth centuries than in the later. Papias is found in the Councils of A.D. 451, 503, 869. The fifth, or possibly the sixth century is the time when the church was built and these inscriptions engraved. There is a doubt whether the formula was in vogue as early as the fourth century; otherwise I should have suggested a fourth century date for such a name as Teucer.

the same church, of which we have supposed that 2 was the dedicatory inscription. The explanation is that this church fell into ruins, either having been destroyed by the Arabs when Barata was captured by them somewhere about A.D. 700, or having suffered from earthquake; and it was restored or rebuilt at a later time. The restoration was very complete. The roof had fallen in, but considerable part of the walls was standing, with the doorway on the west, the windows of the apse on the east and the lower part of the windows on the sides. The height to which the walls remained standing does not favour the hypothesis of an earthquake;¹ and therefore we regard it as pretty certain that this church was destroyed by the Arabs somewhere about A.D. 700, and rebuilt as a memorial of Papadia at a later date (in the ninth century probably, as we shall show in a later paragraph).

When the epitaphs are regarded in this chronological order, it is apparent that they indicate a degeneration of religious feeling and a reversion to the simplest ancient belief about the grave. Just as the ancient grave was a temple, the home of the dead, who is a god identified with and partly merged in the supreme deity, so in this late Christian period the church is, so to say, the sepulchral monument; but the point of distinction remains that, so far as we can discover, the Christian was never actually buried inside his church monument. Still it was the fact that the one great religious duty, alike in this late time and in the oldest period, was to prepare a grave, and the grave was a sanctuary. No trace remained, so far as we can observe, of the idea that the church was a place of

¹ That earthquakes occurred in this volcanic region may be assumed as certain. At Daghile my wife was informed that a severe shock had been felt there two years ago. At Bin Bir Kilibise I was told by a native that no earthquake was known to have ever occurred there; but I distrust his evidence.

instruction in moral duty and religious thought ; the church was in itself holy, and it was a duty supreme above every other—so far as remains show—to build a grave-church.

Several of these epitaphs, especially 2, 4, 5, were engraved on churches of an earlier time, which had sunk into ruins (probably when the city was destroyed by the Arabs, as it must have been, owing to its exposed situation ¹) and afterwards been restored and largely rebuilt. The rebuilding must be connected with the epitaph, and the restoration of a ruined church was evidently equally meritorious with the building of a new one, and carried the right to be buried at the doorway and to have the epitaph engraved on the central column supporting the door.

The deterioration in religious feeling was accompanied by a deterioration in education. A glance at the sequence of the inscriptions is sufficient to show this. The examples given above are proof enough. Christianity is the religion of an educated people, and deterioration on the religious side implies and produces deterioration also on the educational side. A successful defence against barbarous foes has often stimulated a people to higher intellectual effort ; but the successful defence of Asia Minor against the Arabs produced no such effect. We can hardly call it a national defence, though the people were forced to take some measures for self-defence, and the epitaph of Philaretos, given above, shows some pride in a defender of the country. The repulse of the Arabs, however, was mainly due to a professional army and one which was in a considerable degree foreign and mercenary. The people of Barata threw themselves on the protection of the saints. They built churches. They made the churches an essential part of

¹ The possibility must be left open that an earthquake caused the ruin. But in Nos. I. and VI. it seemed probable that ruin by an earthquake would have been more wide-reaching.

their defences. When their city was destroyed by the Arabs, they made Deghile, three miles to the west and high on the hills, the centre of their state, and fortified it. The rock peaks, which were most vital points in the line of defence or immediately outside of it, were occupied by grave-churches, and thus placed under the protection each of its special saint. A people so devoted to saints and holy places has not in itself the elements of vigour or of education ; and the Turkish conquest of a degenerating nation was the inevitable result.

In church No. III. at Deghile we have a good example of a series of constructions, the sequence of which can be determined both architecturally and epigraphically. The church was built according to a vow made by a group of persons, whose names are given on the inner front of the apse :

12. The vow of Akylas and Valerius [sons of Vic ?]torius. The vow of Indakos, son of Valerius. The vow of Dometios. They, having made a vow, completed (the church). [The vow] of Cle[mens], of Valerius, of Dometios.

This inscription is expressed in an earlier formula, stating a principle which, at least in outward expression, is more in accordance with the nature of Christianity. The reason for the vow is not mentioned. There is no overt association with a grave. Yet we may suspect, from the development which occurred later, that even here the vow was not unconnected with sepulture. That, indeed, cannot be absolutely proved ; but it is certain that a stately tomb and a less conspicuous one were placed in the south end of the narthex, and that the stately tomb bears the name of [Vic ?]torius the Presbyter, who seems to be the father of two of the dedicants.¹

All these names, except Indakos, passed into Christian

¹ The name of [Vic]torius is unfortunately mutilated both on the apse and on the tomb in the narthex. This mutilation prevents certainty.

nomenclature, and afford no criterion of date. Indakos is not found in the list of bishops at the councils 325–879 A.D., but occurs in Lycaonian Christian inscriptions of the fourth or fifth century as the name of a bishop and other Christians. From this one name no argument as to date can be drawn safely.

Then, some time later, Longinus son of Indakos died; and in his memory there was erected a triple gateway leading into an open space, which was bounded on the south by the church and on the north by a private house of larger size than is usual in these ruins. We may conjecture that some or all of the people connected with the construction of the church belonged to the family which owned this house. On one of the supporting pillars of the gateway was engraved the epitaph—

13. In memory of Longinus, son of Indakos, the presbyter.

On another of the pillars was engraved the inscription—

14. Through the vow of Paul, son of Longinus.

The gateway, then, was erected by Paul, according to a vow, as a sepulchral monument to his father Longinus. A gateway must lead into something; and there can be no doubt that the space between the house and the church was in some way marked off, and the gateway was constructed as a more splendid entrance to it. It is a pity that we did not excavate this space completely in order to determine its character, and whether there were family graves in it.

Then some years passed, and the construction was enlarged. The narthex of the church was carried far out to the north to join the house, and a series of arches was built on the inside of this prolongation. The whole space between the church and the house was thus enclosed completely by walls. An inscription on one of the arches gives

the reason and the date for this enlargement and for the whole series of constructions.

15. Through the vow of Basil the presbyter, there was completed the Presbyterion under Leo the most holy metropolitan until Constantine the most holy metropolitan during 51 years. And, being involved in powerlessness and unable to consummate the divine teachings, of my own free will and voluntary choice I begged leave to resign the much-loved liturgy of Christ; but I have persevered in prayer¹; and I entreat the Merciful One for forgiveness of my sins and at the same time of (the sins of) Irene my wife.

It was written by the hand of Basil the presbyter, in the month of September, indiction the fourth.

What the Presbyterion was I am unable to say.² The

¹ I am indebted to M. Clermont Ganneau for the interpretation of the letters *επημενιμε* as *ἐπι(με)μένημαι*. This I prefer to the idea that also has occurred to me, *ἐπιμένουμε(ν)*; for the omission of the reduplication is found also in *δυνημένον* for *δεδυνημένου* (which was unknown to the distinguished French scholar and explorer, when he sent me the emendation). The augment is also omitted in *[τ]ε[λι]δθη*. M. Clermont Ganneau's suggestion (for which I am most grateful to him) sets aside the interpretation given in my *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces*, p. 258 f., on the suggestion of another distinguished scholar. Several points in the inscription which I could not understand in my first interrupted copy have been completed by study for many days during 1907. I owe to M. Ganneau also the reading *δηδάγματα*.

² It perhaps was a church presided over by a presbyter, as distinguished from a church where there was a bishop. Then a Kollegion (mentioned in 17) was a church where there was a college of several presbyters. Church No. III. at Bin Bir Kilibise was a Kollegion, and it is one of the larger churches. No. XXI. has a bishop's chair. No. I. at Deghile had a screen fixed across the first two columns of the nave, and must therefore have had a college of presbyters attached to it. The same is the case with several other of the churches, in which the apse (originally the space allotted to the body of presbyters) was found insufficient, and the eastern end of the nave was screened off for their benefit. Another interpretation of Presbyterion has been suggested, that it meant a place (church) where the presbyters met. In that case the Presbyterion would be equivalent to the Kollegion. It has been suggested also that the word is here used in the sense which is well known elsewhere (see Sophocles, *Lexicon of Later and Byzantine Greek*, s.v.) viz., "the office of a presbyter." In that case the inscription would not mention formally any building, but would simply record that "by the vow of Basil the presbyter his office as presbyter was completed": this I cannot accept, for one does not vow to terminate one's presbyterate; Basil was compelled by ill health to do so. The vow of Basil was

name is in some way applied to include the entire complex of buildings, whose construction we have just described. The period of fifty-one years cannot possibly denote the time required for Basil's small additions; and in all probability it gives the whole time from the inception to the completion;¹ and Basil prides himself on having put the finishing touches to a work called a Presbyterion, which had been in process for fifty-one years. Leo was metropolitan bishop of Iconium at the second council of Nicaea in A.D. 787; and therefore the fifty-one years may fairly be reckoned from 790 to 840, or 800 to 850.

This very precise calculation gives a date and a welcome confirmation for our previous results. About A.D. 800 the later custom of putting purely sepulchral inscriptions on a church and regarding the Church as practically a sepulchral monument had not yet come into fashion. It was then still usual to state simply that a church was erected in accordance with a vow, even although (as in this case) a grave was placed in the narthex and the church was in a certain way memorial and sepulchral. Before 850 a gateway adjoining the church and forming part of the series of ecclesiastical constructions was inscribed with a memorial inscription in memory of Longinus the presbyter. About 850, when the narthex was enlarged, there was placed in the new wall an epitaph of the latest and poorest character—

to do something, and the object of the vow is here defined as *τελειῶσαι τὸ πρεσβυτέριον*; in No. 12 the object of the vow is simply *τελέσαι* (*τὴν οἰκοδομήν*); in No. 16 it is *τελέσαι* (or *τελειῶσαι*) *τὸ κολλήγιον*: the completion of the Kollegion in the one case, and the completion of the Presbyterion in the other case, must be interpreted as exactly parallel to each other. The interpretation which we reject might be taken to imply that Basil vowed, if he completed fifty years of the presbyterate, to make the building, on which (about 855 A.D.) he engraved his inscription: the relationship of the other persons would then be the only evidence as to the time over which the series of buildings extended; but this would give a very similar result, only less narrowly defined.

¹ This is not a logical or grammatical construction; but the sentence is illogical in any interpretation.

16. Here lies Sergius in the month, fourteenth, of Octouberius.

The exact year when Basil, now a very old man, wrote his inscription (which is practically his epitaph, and which in that view may be compared with the epitaph of St. Avircius Marcellus, engraved in the seventy-second year of his age, under his orders and oversight, on the tombstone which he had provided for himself) was a fourth indiction ; and, as M. Clermont Ganneau points out in his letter to me, this must either be 840 or 855 A.D. I prefer the later date, as suiting better the letters and the whole circumstances.

I must state in general that all the architectural facts mentioned are due originally to the knowledge and quick observation of Miss Bell, though she must not be regarded as responsible for the theories which I base on them or the form in which I state them.

The inscriptions on church No. III. at Bin Bir Kilisse throw light on and receive light from the group of inscriptions in No. III. at Deghile. In the nave above the arcades and over the apse was engraved in small groups of letters—

17. [Certain persons, whose description and names are lost] having made a vow in common, completed the Kollegion.

On the outside of the apse is the one given above as No. 1. Which of these is earlier, and which later, or are they contemporary ? We found no traces of reconstruction in this church ; and therefore it is to be presumed that it was constructed at one time by one group of persons, who inscribed inside the record of their action in a most conspicuous and honourable place. Outside, one of them was permitted to inscribe the record of the sepulchral character of the building. The latter record was not as yet permitted to be inscribed on one of the doorposts, but was relegated

to a less honourable but still conspicuous position on the apse. A church had not yet come to be regarded as practically equivalent to a sepulchral monument ; but popular opinion was far on the way to that stage ; and therefore this church belongs to the period intermediate between the inception and completion of the Presbyterion No. III. at Deghile, say about 840 A.D. The inscription inside the Kollegion is closely related in character to that on the apse inside the Presbyterion, but rather later in style than the latter ; both record in the earlier fashion that the building was made through the vow of certain individuals. The inscription on the outside wall of the Kollegion has a place not unlike that of Nos. 13 and 14 outside the Presbyterion, keeping the sepulchral record outside the church, and it approximates in character rather to Nos. 6, 7, than to Nos. 2-5. Epigraphically, therefore, the conclusion is that the Presbyterion was begun about 805 A.D. ; church No. II. at Deghile bearing inscriptions 6 and 7, was built about 820 ; the gateway at the north-east end of the Presbyterion with inscriptions 13, 14, about 830 ; church No. III. at Bin Bir Kilisse about 840 ; while the Presbyterion was completed about 855.

As to the relation of the older gods to the saints of the Orthodox Church, we have learned little. There is not here a continuous tradition, as there is at Iconium where the Christian population has never died out. At Barata the Christians probably maintained themselves for some time after the Seljuk conquest. There is a rude fortification, a walled village, evidently of a very late period, in the southern part of the lower town. It cannot be Turkish, for there has never been a mosque inside of it, and the fortifications are not such as we should readily attribute to the Seljuks. In the upper part of the town one of the churches has been transformed into a mosque in the early

Turkish period.¹ The situation here during the century following the Turkish conquest in 1072 was evidently similar to that which existed at a later time in Smyrna before that city was finally conquered by Tamerlane in 1402; the upper town of Barata, and the Castle of Smyrna, were held by the invading Turks: part of the lower town of Barata, and the port of Smyrna, were fortified and held by the Christians. Many other cases are known and some have been described elsewhere, in which a Christian and a Turkish village continued to exist side by side after the Turkish conquest, though gradually the Christian population either died out or became Moslem.² So it was at Barata. The lower town is now purely Moslem, while the upper town is absolutely uninhabited, and it was only through our excavations that the transformation of one of the churches into a mosque was discovered. Other churches were made into Turkish houses, as the excavations showed. As the Moslem population has died out, these have been abandoned and gradually filled up and covered.

If the Christian population of Barata had possessed sufficient energy, it would have maintained its continuity and would have preserved the memory of its saints and its festivals, for the Seljuk Sultans seem not to have been hostile to the Christian population of their dominions. It was internal and moral weakness, combined with the destruction of industry and civilization by the hordes of nomad Turkmens (who were never in any real sense subject to the Sultans until the nineteenth century), not persecution by the government, which obliterated (except in

¹ This is No. XV. (which Strykowski mixes up with No. XVI.). Another of the churches, No. X., was transformed into a bakery in that same period.

² For example Tefeni, the town of St. Stephen, and Karamanli, the men of the chief Karaman, and Sivasli, the people of Sevaste, and Seljukler, the Seljuks, were two such pairs of neighbouring villages: see *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. p. 303, ii. pp. 576, 581.

sporadic remnants) the Christianity of central Anatolia during the twelfth century. Through the destruction of the Christian tradition we are reduced to the evidence of epigraphy and nomenclature. In the city our researches disclosed in one church the name of Michael. And in the hills around there is some slight evidence. In a memorial chapel No. VII. at Daghile, which bears the epitaph of Paul on the outside of the north wall and has a grave in the entrance just outside the door on the west, there is on the apse an invocation to St. Conon, whose memory was specially revered in Isauria and the surrounding districts : ἄγιε Κόνων β[οήθει ?]. This may be taken as a proof that the chapel built as a memorial of Paul, whether by himself before his death or by his relatives after he was dead, was dedicated to St. Conon, a popular saint in Pamphylia, Isauria and Lycaonia. As the church of Paul is near the family house on the north side of No. III., this Paul may be the person mentioned in inscription 14. That would give 850–880 as the date of this memorial church of Paul, which is highly probable epigraphically.

It is also probable that the name Mahalitch,¹ by which the Turks call the highest peak of the mountain, contains a reminiscence of Michael, and that this lofty peak was dedicated by the Christians to the commander of the hosts of angels. The apse of the memorial chapel of Leo on the peak was formerly covered with fresco, of which only a very small part remains, showing ornamentation in interlaced circles and the broken first letters of the name of a saint.

¹ Often pronounced Mahlitch, especially with a vocalic ending, e.g. Mahlije (*h* aspirated); but the longer form must be the older.

The spelling is execrable : and yet it must be remembered that these are the epitaphs of persons of some wealth, who could afford to make constructions in or around the church, and who received the honour of a church-grave.

I could read the A of *Ἄγιος* and part of a letter which was probably M.

The names of Conon and Michael take us into the ordinary angel-service of Byzantine times. In the half-magical, half-liturgical superstition of the period no name was more often used as that of a heavenly protector and champion than the name of Michael the Archangel.

By A.D. 850 the pressure of the Arabs on Asia Minor was being relaxed, rather from their growing weakness and the disorganization of the unwieldy Caliphate, than from the strength or energy of the Byzantine Empire. The population of Barata, who had deserted the town at the foot of the mountain about A.D. 700, had been comparatively safe from the Arab raids in their high mountain abodes; and now they began to return and to rebuild the lower town, which, as it now lies before us in ruins, belongs to the two centuries 850-1050. Church-construction was the order of the day, and the main business of the inhabitants. We observed no evidence of corporate life or municipal or social activity except in this form. Society seems to have gone back almost to the old theocratic system of primitive Anatolia, in a degenerated form, with the Imperial Byzantine government standing apart in the background and occasionally intervening. In the two parts of the town, upper and lower,¹ there are about thirty churches. A few of these may possibly have survived from the time before the Arab conquest. Several were standing half ruined, and were reconstructed with new roofs and part of the walls rebuilt, as for example Nos. I., VI., VII., and XXI. But the great majority were new buildings, some perhaps on old foundations. The variety of design and the beauty of outline are remarkable. One would at first sight

¹ These form one whole, distinguished from Deghile three miles away on the mountain.

say that there was no degeneration in church architecture. Yet even here the details will not bear examination. The plan was traditional and good; the work was poor and bad. The measurements were always rough and inaccurate. In no case does any side correspond exactly to the opposite side. No real liking for the work appears, no loving care to make it as rich and as beautiful as possible. The mouldings are flat and poor, the walls bare, the lintels and other parts where ornament was almost necessary show poor designs or are perfectly plain. Very often two walls which meet are not worked into one another, but simply touch, as if one had been added at a later time; and yet both belong to the original plan and form parts of the original work.

Still, with all their faults, the buildings have a dignity and simplicity which are very effective. The great tradition of Byzantine architecture was preserved to the very end in this remote part of the Empire. It did not decay and die out gradually; it merely ceased when the Christian Empire expired, and when there was no longer any theatre for its activity.

Apart from the church architecture, there is little to say in favour of this provincial Byzantine town. Monasteries multiplied: they abound all over the mountain. The people seem to have been wholly dominated by ecclesiastic interests. Much of the land must have passed into the possession of the monasteries, and so been withdrawn from the service of the state. Patriotism could not survive in such an atmosphere; and there is no reason to think that the Imperial government either tried or deserved to rouse a national and loyal spirit, for it was becoming steadily more oriental, more despotic and more rigid. But the major part of the blame for the national decay must be laid on the Orthodox Church. The nation had been delivered

over to its care. It had been supreme and its authority unquestioned, after the Iconoclasts had been put down. The result was that art and learning and education were dead, and the monasteries were left. The Orthodox Church had allied itself with autocracy against the people, and with the superstitious mob against the heretics and the thinkers. Its triumph meant the ruin of the nation and the degradation of higher morality and intellect and Christianity and art. In our excavations, never deep, we did not find any article worth picking up.

But a high standard of material comfort still reigned in the mountain. The delightful air could not be ruined. The water supply, bountifully provided in early time, was cared for and maintained in good order. The vines grew generously on the volcanic soil of the hillsides. Whatever else failed, the wine-presses, which we found in numbers, were still trodden,¹ the harvests were still reaped, and the fruit still gathered from the trees. Pope, in the end of the Dunciad, describing the chosen refuge of Dulness, might have been speaking of the Kara Dagh under the sway of the Orthodox Church—

To happy convents, bosomed deep in vines,
Where slumber abbots, purple as their wines² ;
To isles of fragrance, lily-silvered vales,
Diffusing odours on the panting gales.

Whether the spirit of the two following lines would also suit, our information does not enable us to judge—

To lands of singing and of dancing slaves,
Love-whispering woods and lute-resounding waves.

If they did suit, the Orthodox Church would have restored one more feature of the primitive Anatolian ritual; but the general character of that Church does not lead us to believe that they suited.

¹ Strictly speaking, the presses were crushed down by lever power.

² We found the tomb of "Αβας Πέτρος Παπᾶς.

NOTE.—It will be convenient to place here together the text of the inscriptions quoted:—

1. ἐνθάδε κατὰ κητε ἡ Στεφάνου, μὴ γνοῦσα χάρουσά ποτε, μηνὴ Νοέβρου ἰ': on the adjoining stone to left, αὕτη [ἡ] κατύκυσής μου ἡς ἔδνα ἔδνος, δδε κατυκύσο αὕτη[ν]: i.e., κατοίκησις, κατοικήσω: *Studies in the History*, etc., p. 261. See also no. 17.

2. On the capital of the pillar, Θεόδωρος δοῦλο(s) Χ(ριστο)ῦ: below on the shaft, ἐκημήθῃ ἡ Παπαδῆα μηνὴ Μαρτίου ἡς τὰς δεκαπέτε· ἀμήν· ὁ Θ(εὸ)s μακαρήσῃ τήν. For the strange formula, stating the day of the month or the deceased's age, on the analogy of the modern expression for hours of the day, but with ἡμέρας understood instead of ὥρας, compare an epitaph in a village cemetery on the mountain ἔθα (sic!) κατὰ κητε Πανταλέον· ἐκνμίθη μηνὴ Γενοαρήου ἡς τὰς τρηάντα μῆαν. τήν also is a modern usage.

3. ἐκνμῆθ[η] ὁ Δομεστηκὸς μην[ι] Μαΐω δ'.

4. ἔνθα κατὰ κητε Μουσιανο[ῦ] Γ[ε]ωργίω λασυπλιγασυπωμινας.

5. ἔνθα κατὰ κητε ἡ μακάρηος Χηονῆα μηνὴ Πεφρουαρήου.

6. ἔνθα κῆτε Φηλάρετος Ἀκύλα· ἀπέθαιον ἰς τὸν πόλεμον μηνὴ Μαΐου λ', ἰνδ. δ. The first person is certain, a usage common in older epitaphs.

7. ἔνθα κῆτε Ἀκύλας· ἀπέθαιεν Ἀπρηλήου ἰδ', ἰνδ. ἰ'.

8. ἔνθα κατὰ κητε Παῦλος· ἀπέθαιε μηνὴ Ἀπρηλύου γ'.

9. εὐχῆ Τεύκρου Παπίου. Here and in similar short inscriptions εὐχῆ is possible; but the analogy of many longer ones proves that εὐχῆ is right and that a passive verb is to be understood as following.

10. εὐχῆ Νησιόν Τιβερίου.

11. εὐχῆ Μαμμᾶ τριβ(ούνου).

12. (1) εὐχῆ Ἀκύλου καὶ Οὐαληρίου [Βικ?]τορί[ου].

(2) εὐχῆ Ἰνδάκου Οὐαληρίου.

(3) εὐχῆ Δομετίου· εὐξάμενοι ἐτέλησαν.

(4) On the central stone of the apse, between stones (1) and (2), are engraved irregularly Κλη[μεντος?] Οὐαληρίου Δομετίου, round the ornate cross which covers the middle of this central stone of the arch. On the high-built grave which fills the south end of the narthex is engraved [Βικ]τόρης πρεσβύ(τερος). The form -τορης, gen. τορήου, is of a common class: compare Βασήλης, -ήου, in 15, Σέργης in 16. Akylas (Aquila of Acts) is probably the person who occurs in 6 and 7, on a church close by.

13. ὑπὲρ μηνῆμης Λονγίνου Ἰνδάκου πρεσβυ(έρου). The second *n* is corrected from *ε* by the engraver.

14. εὐχῆ Παύλου Λονγίνου.

15. εὐχῆ Βασηλήου πρεσβυτέρου [τ]ε[λι]όθη τὸ πρεσβυτέριον ὑπὸ Λέοντος τοῦ ἀγιοτάτου μητροπολίτου ἕως Κοσταντήνου τοῦ ἀγγοτάτου μητροπολίτου ἔτ(η) αὐ. κὲ ἐλ[θ]όντος¹ μου ἐν ἀδυναμίᾳ κὲ μὴ δυνημένον μου ἐκτελῖν τὰ θῆα δηδάγματα, ἐκουσῆα μου τῆ γνόμ[η] κὲ αὐθερετοβουλῆ (or as two words) παρετησάμην τὴν πολυπόθητον τοῦ Χ(ριστ)οῦ λειτουργίαν, τῇ δὲ προσευχῇ ἐπημένιμε, κὲ παρακαλῶ τὸν ἐλέημοναν ὡς εὖσπλάχνος μὲν δὲς ἀ[μ]αρτιμάτων ἄφεσην ἅμα κὲ Ἡρίνις τίς συνβήου μο[υ].

ἐ[γρ]ά[φ]θι διὰ χιρ[ὸ]ς Β[α]σ[ι]λίου πρεσ[βυτέ]ρου μινὶ Σεπτεβρίου ιν. δ'.

The text is very worn and extremely difficult, the letters are rude, the lines irregular, and the stone friable. Unless it had been protected by the arch from the weather, the stone would have been quite illegible. And unless I had had the opportunity of studying the inscription for three weeks in all states of the light, I could not have deciphered the text completely. As stated above, I am greatly indebted to M. Clermont Ganneau. *δυνημένον* is certain.

16. On the west front of the northern enlargement of the narthex of No. VII. at Deghile.

ἐνθα κῆτε Σέργης μινὴ (sic!) ἰδ' Ὁκτουβηρήου.

17. Above the arcades and apse of the nave of No. III. at Bin Bir Kilisse. The southern arcades had fallen in, when I copied the inscription in 1882; all have now fallen. [οἱ δέινες] τὸ κολλῆγιν ἐν κοινῷ εὐξάμενοι ἐτέ[λεσαν] or λείωσαν]. No 1 is on the outside of the apse of the church.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE DISCIPLE WHOM JESUS LOVED.

IN the second part of the Fourth Gospel, which deals exclusively with the Lord's Supper, the Cross, and the Resurrection, the Evangelist introduces a figure elsewhere unknown, "the Disciple whom Jesus loved." This portion of the Gospel is doubly marked off from the first twelve chapters, which deal with the public ministry; (a) by the general reflections on the results of Jesus' public work in xii. 37-50;

¹ Perhaps *ἐνότος*, as I formerly read, is right; but I think the text is AI (where I is followed by a blurred space for a square θ) and not N (followed by a hole in the stone left empty by the engraver).

(b) by the transition in xiii. 1 to those to whom Jesus now gave Himself exclusively, "His own which were in the world," whom as His beloved "He loved unto the end." Among these one is conspicuous as "*the beloved disciple*" *par éminence*. He is not merely [Jesus' "friend" (*φίλος*), as Lazarus was (xi. 3, 11), but his *ἀγαπητός*, as Jesus Himself is the *Ἀγαπητός* of the Father; He is the type of true discipleship. This distinction the author of the mediating appendix, chap. xxi., does not venture to claim even for Peter (xxi. 15, 16, 17), but lays it at the feet of "the disciple that testifieth these things and wrote these things." In a veiled way the author of the appendix, whom we may designate R (Redactor), allows it to appear that *he* understands by it John the son of Zebedee, so that thenceforth this identification has become current. But its verification depends on the content of the work *without* the Appendix.

In the substance of the work the Beloved Disciple appears but three times; at the Supper, at the Cross, and at the Tomb. Except at the Cross he is introduced in association with Peter, but certainly not as of lower rank. Rather he appears in both the other scenes in the rôle of one who precedes Peter, the fountain authority of the Church's evangelic tradition, in apprehension of the real significance of what transpires. At the cross, where Peter's absence is painfully conspicuous, he becomes by appointment of Jesus Himself the guardian of Jesus' mother.

From these three interrelated appearances of the Beloved Disciple it is important to distinguish two other groups of passages which fall outside our consideration because they either are (a) indefinite, and need not refer to the same, nor indeed to any specific individual; or else (b) are from a later writer, who may easily have attached a different meaning to the phrase "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

In the former category of indefinite references are to be placed (1) those of John i. 35-42, where the analogy with Mark i. 16-20 may well lead the reader mentally to introduce the figures of James and John. But not only have we here no allusion whatever to "the disciple whom Jesus loved," the phenomenon is not even connected primarily with the introduction of this new personality. Its real explanation must be found in connexion with the general question, "Why is there no mention in the Fourth Gospel of the *two* sons of Zebedee, James and John, the "sons of thunder" ?¹ This is an entirely separate problem. Perhaps the unnamed one of the two disciples of John i. 40 may be one of the sons of Zebedee, and some may even find a trace of the brother in the fact that "Andrew findeth first (*πρῶτον*, i.e. before he found others; cf. ver. 43, *τῆ ἐπαύριον εὕρισκει Φίλιππον*) his brother Cephas." For some reason the Fourth Evangelist avoids mention of either of the sons of Zebedee. But what light does this throw upon the question who is meant by "the disciple whom Jesus loved" ?

(2) In the account of Peter's Denial, John xviii. 15-27, a synoptic story intimately connected with the Appendix (cf. xxi. 15-19), we have again the indefinite mention of "another disciple known to the high-priest," who procures Peter's admission to the court and then disappears. There is nothing to prove that this was "the disciple whom Jesus loved"; the inference is simply suggested to the reader's mind in view of Mark xiv. 33, perhaps intentionally, as is almost certainly the case in the Appendix.

(b) Unlike the Gospel as a whole (1) the Appendix introduces openly "the sons of Zebedee" (xxi. 2). A penumbra of indefiniteness is secured by the addition to the list of

¹ For a possible solution of this question, see my article, "The Martyr Apostles," in *EXPOSITOR*, 1907.

five mentioned by name in xxi. 2, of "two other of His disciples," possibly because of interest in the number seven.¹ But given "the two sons of Zebedee," the process of elimination becomes so easy that the reader cannot really fail to identify "the disciple whom Jesus loved, which also leaned back on his breast at the supper, and said, Lord, who is he that betrayeth Thee?" (John xxi. 20) with the "witness-bearer" who, according to the Appendix, "beareth witness of these things and wrote these things" (xxi. 24). The author of the Appendix, accordingly, supplies the missing "sons of Zebedee," and, without positively so stating, leads the reader to infer that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is John, the survivor of the two. As the passage on Peter's Denial (John xiii. 36-38; xviii. 15-18, 25-27) is so intimately connected with the Appendix² it is reasonable to infer that the nameless "other disciple known to the high-priest" of this story (xviii. 10 f.) is meant to be understood in the same way. The reader of chaps. xviii. f. might well ask, How is it, after the disciples have "gone their way,"³ that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" can still be beside Him at the foot of the cross, xix. 26? The answer (of R) is the introduction in xviii. 15 f., together with his insertion of the incident of Peter's Denial, of the "other disciple known to the high-priest." The trait may have been suggested by the following of the "young man" (usually identified as John surnamed Mark) of Mark xiv. 51 f. Other reasons

¹ Cf. the seven in Papias, and *Clem. Hom.* xviii., xiv., the patriarchs, as "the seven pillars of the world." In Gal. ii. 9, Peter, James and John are "pillars" (cf. Rev. iii. 12). Was the early church, like "the world," and like "Wisdom's house" (Prov. ix. 1), conceived as built on seven pillars?

² On this story as an insertion, along with other material related to Synoptic tradition by the author of the Appendix, see Bacon, *Introd. to N. T. Lit.*, p. 274.

³ John xviii. 8f., the Johannine euphemism for the desertion of the eleven, Mark xiv. 27, 50; Luke omits.

concur to prove this whole story of Peter's Denial an interpolation by R.¹ Were it part of the original stock, whose interpreter of events is "the disciple whom Jesus loved," we should expect this title, and not the indefinite "another disciple known to the high-priest."

As both (a) indefinite, and (b) redactional, John xviii. 15 falls outside our consideration. Whether the writer of the Gospel in its original form had a reason for omitting "the sons of Zebedee," and whether his new figure of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" was meant as a substitute for them, and if so, was a mere periphrase for "John," is a question quite independent of ours: What or whom did the first author mean by "the disciple whom Jesus loved"? For we are not confined to redactors' theories of the authorship and meaning of the writings they edit, whether in the New Testament or the Old.

(2) Whatever be the derivation in whole or in part of John xix. 31-37, the famous crux of xix. 35 cannot be fairly interpreted without taking into consideration its manifest relation to xxi. 24. The phraseology alone would compel us here to recognize the hand of R. Once more we find the indefinite "He that saw it" (ὁ ἑωρακώς) brought into the same mysterious relation with "the disciple whom Jesus loved" as in the Appendix. The writer will not say in so many words, "This was 'the disciple whom Jesus loved';" still less "This was John the son of Zebedee," but he makes it impossible to think of anyone else. Phraseology, interest in authentication, method pursued, are those of R. We have no alternative but to class John xix. 35 with the references which are both (a) indefinite and (b) redactional. It is R who speaks, and his intention is that the witness of the "blood and water" from Jesus' side shall be taken to be no other than "the disciple whom

¹ Bacon, *Introd. to N. T.*, 1900, p. 274.

Jesus loved" of verse 26. Whether he also means that this disciple shall be identified with the author of 1 John and 3 John depends upon our judgment of the relation of John xix. 34f. to 1 John v. 6-9 and 3 John 12. The present writer sees no insuperable obstacle to understanding the reference *ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν* of the emphatic "witness" of 1 John v. 6-9. In that case R will be not only asserting his conviction that the phenomenon of the blood and water was witnessed by "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (in his view John), but in addition that it is the same who, in the Epistles whose language he borrows, lays such stress upon the "water and blood," declaring this to be a "witness of the Spirit" in some sense present and eternal. R's standpoint, in other words, is identically that of subsequent tradition, except that instead of plain statement he shelters himself behind purposed ambiguity.

To test the value of R's answer to the question: Who is meant by "the disciple whom Jesus loved," we must now return to the three unequivocal entries of this figure upon the stage, and ask ourselves what their significance is in the light of the original context. We may distinguish between the general context of the writing as a whole, and the individual context of each of the three entries, considering the latter first.

1. John xiii. 1-30. The extraordinary character of the Johannine story of the Last Supper is quite inadequately stated when it is simply pointed out that it is not the Pass-over; that it has not the institution of the Eucharist, which this Evangelist, on the contrary, connects with the Feeding of the Multitude, John vi., a narrative of the Agape cycle; and that it almost eclipses the Eucharist by the emphasis laid upon the new rite of foot-washing, which Jesus institutes in perpetuity (ver. 15) as His own complement to the rite of baptism (ver. 10). All this is

surprising enough when we reflect what significance already attached, even in Paul's time, to the story of the institution of the sacrament by Jesus at the supper "that same night in which he was betrayed" (1 Cor. xi. 20, 23 ff.). But it is not the whole truth. In John xiii. 1-30 the supper is not a Passover, and not a Eucharist. There is a sacrament, with the bread and the cup after supper. But it is a sacrament for only one of those present—"the son of perdition," and for him it is a sacrament of judgment! By it "Satan entered into him." There is no need to exaggerate. The phenomenon has not so startling an effect as it would have if this were new material introduced by the Fourth Evangelist *de suo*, instead of being a mere retention of the synoptic trait of the Betrayer whose "hand dipped with his Master in the dish" (Matthew xxvi. 21-25 = Mark xiv. 18-21 = Luke xxii. 21-23). It is significant enough as being the *only* trait which the Fourth Evangelist sees fit to preserve from the story of the Lord's Supper. The removal of the institutional teachings to a connexion with the story of the origin of the Agape in vi. 52-58, the removal of connexion with the Passover, and the substitution of the rite of foot-washing for the Eucharist have their explanation, no doubt, in the Evangelist's own view of these rites, and of their relation to Judaism on the one side, Gnosticism on the other. This particular trait, retained alone from the synoptic story of the Supper, can only be explained by the desire to counteract a false value attached by some to the Eucharist. Two passages throw light upon it. (1) The Evangelist's own teachings regarding the sacrament in vi. 52-71; (2) the teaching of Paul in 1 Corinthians xi. 29f. concerning that eating of the bread and drinking of the cup unworthily, which becomes a sacrament of judgment and death to those that "discern not the Lord's body."

(1) As regards the Evangelist's view of the sacrament expressed in the chapter on the Agape (chap. vi.) I cannot do better than transcribe the excellent exposition of Mr. E. F. Scott.¹

The discourse in this chapter is based on the preceding miracle, which, in accordance with John's method, becomes the symbolical expression of a permanent religious fact. Christ dispenses to the world the bread of life. He has in Himself an inexhaustible divine life which He imparts from age to age to those who believe on Him. How is this life communicated? It might appear from the earlier portion of the discourse as if the process were conceived as wholly spiritual. Jesus demands a true belief on Himself as the revelation of God, a living communion with Him, an assimilation of our nature to His. But this spiritual process is associated, more and more definitely as the chapter draws to a close, with the ordinance of the Eucharist: "The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I give for the life of the world" (vi. 51). "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you" (53). "He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him" (56). In sayings like these we have direct allusion to the Eucharist as the "medicine of immortality" (Ignat. *Eph.* 20), the means of fellowship between Christ and the believer, the real appropriation of the body and blood of the Lord.

In this chapter, therefore, we seem to have two views wholly contradictory to each other. The imparting of the bread of life, typified in the miracle, is the communication by Jesus of His own mind and spirit to His disciples. It is also identified in a special manner with the outward rite of the Eucharist. The contradiction is partly to be explained as an instance of John's peculiar method. He does not discard the common beliefs, even when they clash with his own, but accepts them formally in order to interpret and spiritualize them. In the present instance he takes the popular conception of the religious value of the Supper, and sets it in the light of a higher and more reasonable conception. The outward ordinance becomes symbolical of the true communion with Christ by a life of faith and obedience. To "eat His flesh and drink His blood" is to appropriate His Spirit, to make yourself one with Him, so that He seems to live again in His disciple. John himself points us to some such symbolical import in his words, by the warning with which the discourse closes: "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing" (vi. 63).

¹ *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology.* E. F. Scott, 1906, p. 123.

(2) To this strong reaction against the popular, crudely superstitious, and non-ethical view of the sacrament as a "medicine of immortality," the Evangelist joins, however, as Scott correctly observes, a mysticism of his own, producing a conception not wholly freed from the magical element, but certainly able to plead even in this respect the great authority of Paul (1 Cor. xi. 29 f.). The sacrament is the means by which one appropriates Christ's spirit, by which one's life is fed by the divine life of the Logos. Because this is something more than an ethical participation, unworthy eating has not merely moral but physical consequences. The open channel of divine grace becomes the opportunity of Satan, to the judgment and death of the unworthy participant. This Pauline doctrine of the *sacrament of judgment* is embodied by our Evangelist in the story of the Designation of the Traitor, the sole feature he thinks it worth his while to retain from the synoptic account of the Supper. "The disciple whom Jesus loved" is made the hierophant of this mystery. the question vainly put by the twelve in the synoptic story "which of them it was that should do this thing,"¹ is answered to this confidant of Jesus' bosom, who is given to understand its working. It is at the solicitation of Peter that "the disciple whom Jesus loved" obtains the explanation; but it does not appear when, if ever, Peter was told the result. Doctrinally, therefore, the teaching our Evangelist finds in the synoptic story of Judas "dipping in the dish" with Jesus at the last Supper is expressed in 1 Corinthians x. 20-22, "I would not that ye should have communion with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the

¹ It is quite uncertain whether our Matthew was known to the Fourth Evangelist (xii. 8 is wanting in Syr-Sin). If so, Matthew xxvi. 25 will have been understood (correctly ?) as a refusal to assume the responsibility of a categorical answer.

cup of devils ; ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of devils." He intimates that it is possible to make even of the Lord's Supper a sacrament of damnation.

It should be needless to say that this is not history, but doctrinal interpretation. No disciple of flesh and blood could have received the positive assurance of the traitorous purpose entertained by Judas, and permitted the traitor to walk forth before his eyes to its accomplishment, without lifting a finger to prevent it. But the disciple of John xiii. 23-30 is not a disciple of flesh and blood. He is the interpreter of the "Petrine" story of the announcement of the betrayal. And he interprets it on the basis of the Pauline doctrine of the sacrament of judgment.

2. John xix. 25-27 deals with the synoptic scene of the Women at the Cross, Matthew xxvii. 55 f. = Mark xv. 41 f. = Luke xxiii. 49. Among these the Fourth Evangelist introduces the mother of Jesus, whose presence, in view of the silence of the synoptic Gospels, and the statements of Mark iii. 21, 31 ff., is somewhat surprising. That of a disciple is even more surprising, in view of the desertion of all which forms so ineradicable an element of the tradition. The entire Johannine scene, so contrary to the representation of all the synoptic Gospels, where the women "stood afar off, beholding" (John xix. 25, "stood by the cross"), and to the historical presuppositions of an execution of this character, suggests that here too it is not a flesh and blood disciple, nor a flesh and blood mother, that enters upon the scene. This mother might rather be she of whom Jesus speaks in Luke xi. 27 f., "they that hear the word of God and keep it"; perhaps in a narrower sense the representative of the adherents of an older faith which had not known the day of its visitation, finding a home with that younger *ecclesia* which took its start from the

cross as the essence and substance of the gospel.¹ For it was not only a conversion of the Gentile world which the great Apostle of the Gentiles looked forward to as the goal of his preaching of "Christ and Him crucified." Paul represented a larger catholicity. At the date of the Fourth Gospel the church of "the circumcision" was a mere remnant of Israel, reconciled (except for an unrecognized heretical element) to the Pauline doctrine of the cross, in fellowship with the church of the uncircumcision, and sustained by it, not to say dependent on it. Already in Paul's lifetime he had established the principle that the Gentile Church should contribute of their carnal things to the poor saints in Jerusalem, whose debtors they were in spiritual things. And beyond even this great achievement there lay in his prophetic vision a grafting in of the natural branches of Israel upon their own olive tree (Rom. xi. 13-32). The author of John xii. 20-32 cannot have been less catholic than Paul in interpreting the significance of the cross. The adaptation which he makes, in xix. 25-27, of the synoptic scene of the Women at the Cross suggests, therefore, in a writer admittedly devoted to symbolism, a Pauline interest in those who were Jesus' "kindred according to the flesh," and probably were his own as well. Like Paul, he finds in the doctrine of the cross the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile; he expects even a dwelling of Shem in the tents of Japheth. But here again the hierophant of the "ministration of the Gentiles" is "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

3. John xx. contains the Fourth Evangelist's only narratives of the Resurrection and the Great Commission. That of the Appendix (xxi. 1 ff.) is by common consent the work

¹ Cf. the taking refuge by the mother of Messiah in Revelation xii. 6 "in the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that there they may nourish her a thousand two hundred and threescore days," perhaps referring to the flight of the church to Pella from Jerusalem.

of a later hand. For R's story of a return of seven of the disciples to their fishing in Galilee is clearly out of harmony with the preceding account of their receiving the Great Commission in Jerusalem (xx. 21-23). Wellhausen¹ has even serious objections to urge against the originality of xx. 24-29 also, because it introduces Thomas as an absentee on that supreme occasion. Whatever the cogency or the inadequacy of this latter plea, the whole content of the resurrection story as related by the synoptic writers, from their account of the empty tomb to the Great Commission and the Pentecostal endowment with the Spirit, is covered by our Evangelist in three scenes, the Empty Tomb (xx. 1-10), the Appearance to Mary Magdalene (xx. 11-18), and the Mission of the Twelve (xx. 19-23). The first at the tomb, the first to believe, was "the disciple whom Jesus loved." He appears as a kind of invisible companion of Peter in the hurried visit to the tomb borrowed from Luke xxiv. 12.² Neither of the two speaks to, nor appears to notice, his companion. The new-found faith of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" does not express itself to Mary Magdalene, who is left "standing without, weeping"; nor even to any of the disciples. His coming and seeing the empty tomb and believing, is all an episode introduced into the Lucan story of the women at the sepulchre without the faintest trace of an effect upon the course of the narrative. Again we must say this is no disciple of flesh and blood. All is precisely as if he were not there. His function indeed has no regard for the persons and conditions of that age. The empty tomb was enough for him. "He saw and believed." He is the type of that faith which does not wait for ocular demonstration, but is quickened

¹ *Erweiterungen u. Aenderungen im Vierten Evangelium*, 1907, p. 27.

² The verse is omitted in some MSS., but the incident is referred to in xxiv. 24, which appears in all.

to full life by "knowing the Scripture that He must rise from the dead." (ver. 9). On independent grounds we must agree with Wellhausen.

The rebuke of Thomas is needless for those who can follow the example of "the disciple whom Jesus loved." Sight for all save the first witnesses must be limited to the empty sepulchre. Their belief must rest upon "the Scripture," where Paul had founded it (1 Cor. xv. 4). Such, as against Peter's, is the faith of "the disciple whom Jesus loved."

In the light of these three individual contexts is it a son of Zebedee, even a glorified son of Zebedee, that the original author intends to present under the mask of "the disciple whom Jesus loved"? Is it both this and his own personality? If so, he uses a strange title,¹ and has a strange way of describing his hero. We are told that it is modesty which accounts for this; the author shrinks from introducing himself by name. Strange modesty, which prefers a title of extreme and exclusive honour to the simple pronoun or mention of the name; and which introduces the personality only to place it in contrast with the weakness and blindness of the rest of the Twelve! We are told that this veiled introduction of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is one of the "touches of the eye-witness." And yet of all the unreal scenes of this gospel of abstractions none are so unreal, none of the *dramatis personae* so phantasmal, as "the beloved disciple" himself, and the symbolic adaptations of synoptic scenes in which he figures.

Let us then turn from that interpretation of this veiled figure which R has imposed on later tradition by his interpo-

¹ Zahn seriously considers the possibility of accounting for the title on the basis of the legend in the Leucian *Acts of John*, where John is the *παρθένος* of Revelation xiv. 4, prevented from accomplishing his intended marriage in order to be reserved for Christ. This is inverting cause and effect.

lations in and additions to the Gospel, and frame for ourselves an interpretation on the basis of the broader context of the original work viewed as a whole.

The view many times advanced since Scholten that the "beloved disciple" is a purely ideal figure is surely more in accord with the nature of his entry on the scene in the three individual contexts just discussed, than that which R has imposed on all subsequent traditional interpretation. In some sense he is an ideal figure, that ideal disciple whom Jesus would choose, and who reads his soul aright. What, then, is ideal discipleship in the Fourth Evangelist's conception? What message will he be supposed to obtain, who reads the very soul of Jesus? To these questions "the spiritual Gospel" leaves room for but one answer. Rarely has it been better stated than in the work of Mr. Scott, from which we have already quoted an exposition of the Johannine doctrine of the sacrament. The essence of the gospel of Christ for our Evangelist centres in the great word "life." He makes himself the great vindicator (*goel*) of Paul, for whom the redemption had been simply "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus making me free from the law of sin and death." To the Fourth Evangelist, as to Paul, the gospel is not precept, but personality and power; "the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelling in you." The cardinal ideas of the Fourth Gospel are defined in the conclusion of the volume we have quoted in three fundamental principles: "(1) Jesus Christ in his actual Person is the revelation of God. (2) The peculiar work of Jesus was to impart Life. (3) The life is communicated through union with Christ. It was inherent in His own Person, and before it can reappear in His disciples they must become in some sense identified with Himself."¹ From these cardinal principles of the

¹ E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 360 ff.

Fourth Gospel it should be possible to deduce the Evangelist's conception of the ideal disciple.

In one sense he must needs correspond to the author himself, whose insight into the deeper meaning of the gospel is the occasion of his writing. With all those who have not seen and yet have believed, the gospel has come to our Evangelist through union with the eternal Christ, the Logos of God. He is of those who, with the great Apostle to the Gentiles, if they had known a Christ after the flesh would know such a Christ no more. He has apprehended him *sub specie eternitatis*, and abides in His bosom, as the glorified Redeemer Himself abides in the bosom of the Father. In the sacrament, at the cross, in the resurrection, he has "put on Christ," and in Him has appropriated the eternal life of God. The ideal disciple cannot be less. He must be an interpreter of the evangelic tradition of Peter in the deeper, larger sense.

But the name by which our author chooses to designate this ideal disciple, suggests another factor in his thought. The "disciple whom Jesus loved" is something more and other than a purely ideal figure. He is not so much ideal as idealized. A very real man has sat for the portrait; but this is not a case of self-portraiture.

We have seen that the "beloved disciple" enters on the scene only in the drama of the cross and resurrection. His gospel of redemption is his by mystic union with Christ in the fellowship of His suffering and the power of His resurrection. We have seen also that he stands in some special antithetic relation to Peter. We have admitted that ultimately it must be one who anywhere, in any generation, enters the eternal life, like the Evangelist himself, by appropriating "the mind which was in Christ Jesus." But the term "disciple whom Jesus loved" cannot well have been coined, nor his relation to the "first" of the

Twelve thus depicted, without a primary reference to that great Apostle who, when even Peter was recreant and blind to the real significance of the doctrine he professed to follow, cut into the very rock foundation of the Church the true gospel of the redemption. No language ever framed can so express the whole heart secret of the Fourth Gospel as that great utterance of Paul, wherein, as against the inadequate apprehension Peter had shown of the true meaning of the cross, he pours out his soul's experience of Christ. If the Fourth Gospel be "the heart of Christ," the heart of the Fourth Gospel is Paul's confession of his faith in Galatians ii. 20: "I have been crucified with Christ; yet I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, WHO LOVED ME (τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με), and gave Himself up for me." In this sense Paul, and whosoever has had Paul's experience—whosoever has thus seen the Lord, whether in the body or out of the body, whosoever has come to "know Him and the power of His resurrection"—is the "disciple whom Jesus loved."

B. W. BACON.

THE AUTHENTICITY AND ORIGINALITY OF THE FIRST GOSPEL.

I. BEFORE the close of the second century of the Christian era the three Synoptic Gospels formed part of the undisputed Canon of the New Testament. And since that time until very recent years their authenticity has not been seriously questioned. At the present day the result of a very searching criticism has been to confirm the authenticity of St. Mark and St. Luke, but to place considerable doubt on the authorship of the Gospel attributed to St. Matthew, and this in spite of what seemed to earlier scholars indis-

putable evidence to the contrary. If the often cited, and now familiar words of Papias quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 39) refer to a Hebrew Gospel of which the existing Greek Gospel is a version, the question of authenticity is set at rest and must be decided in favour of St. Matthew's authorship. But the perplexity begins with the interpretation of these words, which are as follows: *Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἐβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἡρμήνευσε δὲ αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.* 'Matthew composed or compiled the *logia* in the Hebrew dialect. And every one interpreted them as he was able.'

In other passages Eusebius ¹ cites Irenaeus and Origen ² to the effect that St. Matthew wrote a Gospel for the Hebrews in their own language, and also states that "having preached the Gospel to the Hebrews, as he was about to go to others also, he delivered to them the Gospel as preached by him (*τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον*), thus making up for the loss of his presence in person."³ He also mentions a report that Pantaenus having gone to preach to the Indians found that the Apostle St. Bartholomew had already left with them a copy of the Gospel according to St. Matthew written in Hebrew characters.⁴

From these passages the earlier commentators drew the conclusion that St. Matthew first composed his Gospel in Hebrew (no distinction being made between the *logia* mentioned by Papias and the Hebrew Gospel referred to by Irenaeus and Origen), and that afterwards either he himself or some scribe under his supervision translated that Gospel into Greek.

The discovery of the Oxyrhynchus "Sayings of Christ" or *logia*, however, caused a distinction to be made between the Papias *logia*, and the Hebrew Gospel referred to in

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 8. 2.

² *Ibid.* vi. 25.

³ *Ibid.* iii. 24. 6.

⁴ *Ibid.* v. 10. 3.

the other passages. The *logia* were considered to be detached "Sayings of Christ" such as those contained in the Oxyrhynchus fragment without note or comment, and therefore needing explanation. This would account for the words added by Papias: "Every one interpreted them according to his ability" (ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος). Afterwards, it was thought, these 'words' of Christ were incorporated in the Gospel as we now have it.

As for the Hebrew Gospel according to St. Matthew, it has disappeared with the exception possibly of a few fragments; and it is not necessary for the purpose of this paper to discuss the identification with the Hebrew Gospel seen by Jerome at Caesarea or other questions which have arisen concerning it with one exception. That exception, however, is an important one. It has been assumed that the present Greek Gospel according to St. Matthew is a translation of the Hebrew Gospel, and that its authenticity depends on that fact. In the words of the most recent and certainly among the ablest editors of the first Gospel, "Our first Gospel was not originally written in Hebrew, nor is it likely that in its present form it is the work of an Apostle."¹

The first of these two propositions may be assented to without involving the acceptance of the second. It may, however, be remarked in passing that no less an authority than Blass decides that "it is not necessary to admit that Matthew has given us only proverbs and speeches, but nothing or next to nothing of narratives. . . . There is no emphasis on 'sayings' in the passages quoted, as Zahn has well pointed out; the emphasis is chiefly on 'in the Hebrew tongue.'"² Dr. Blass proceeds to show

¹ St. Matthew in the International Critical Commentary, edited by W. C. Allen, p. lxxx.

² The *Expository Times*, August, 1907, p. 491.

by illustration from the Gospel that the Greek St. Matthew bears marks of translation—"one of several translations."

For the purpose of our argument, however, it may be conceded that the Papiian *logia* were detached sayings after the manner of the Oxyrhynchus papyri.

Then it is difficult to discard the evidence that St. Matthew also wrote a Gospel in the Hebrew or Aramaic tongue. No evidence could be more plainly stated, and there is nothing to make it improbable or to contradict it. But on the other hand, the evidence that St. Matthew is the author of the Greek Gospel as we now have it rests on grounds equally or almost equally convincing. From the very first his name has appeared with the other Synoptists as the author of the Gospel attributed to him; and no other name has ever been suggested to take his place. Again, the probability is great that one of the Apostles should have composed a Gospel; and no one of the Apostles could have been more fitted for the task than St. Matthew. His occupation as collector of dues and taxes from men of various nationalities and the necessity of keeping accounts and official records would tend to equip the future Evangelist for his sacred work. On the other hand Matthew, the publican, the member of a despised order, of whom no incident or spoken word has found a place in the Gospel narratives, is perhaps the least likely of the Apostolic body to have won the name of Evangelist unless it rested on fact.

But it is contended that because St. Matthew wrote the *logia* in Hebrew or Aramaic, and the *logia* in the Greek Gospel do not bear the mark of translation, therefore St. Matthew cannot be the author of the first synoptic Gospel.

In this way the evidence of Hebrew *logia* and a Hebrew Gospel by St. Matthew is brought to bear against the authenticity of the Greek Gospel.

The opinion of Dr. Blass in regard to the indications of translation in St. Matthew's Greek Gospel has been already cited. But putting aside this possibility, and granting for the sake of argument that the Greek Gospel according to St. Matthew is an original work, it seems to the present writer that it is still possible to maintain its authenticity on practically the same grounds as that on which the authenticity of the two other synoptic Gospels is maintained. Indeed the acknowledged fact of a Hebrew Gospel composed by this Evangelist is a powerful argument in favour of a similar, but independent work in Greek by the same author. Eusebius states as the motive for writing the Hebrew Gospel the Apostle's desire to console his converts for his absence by the possession of a Gospel in their own tongue. What then is more probable than that the same Evangelist should desire to render the same service to those "others" of whom the historian speaks (*ὡς ἡμελλεν καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέροισι λέγει*, *H.E.* iii. 24. 6)? It is indeed a pure conjecture that St. Matthew's literary work should have been confined to the Hebrew *logia* and Gospel, the existence of which is definitely attested. It is not only possible but *a priori* probable that he composed other *logia* and a Gospel in Greek even if we had not weighty external evidence of the fact.

It is the opinion of Zahn and of other scholars that in the Eusebian quotations the stress is to be laid on the words "in the Hebrew tongue" or "in their own dialect," the historian wishing to note, what was indeed an exceptional fact, that an Aramaic narrative of the life and acts of Christ should have been composed.¹

But the most formidable objection to the authenticity

¹ So complete was the prevalence of the Greek language in early Christian literature that Döllinger (*Studies in European History*, p. 170), writing of the early Christian communities, asserts: "Their liturgies and sermons, and their own early writings, were all exclusively Greek."

of the first Gospel is derived from the result of research into the synoptic relations of the first three Evangelists. These results have shown that nearly the whole of St. Mark's Gospel has been incorporated in the other two synoptic Gospels and, in the words of Mr. Allen,¹ "It is indeed not impossible, but it is very improbable that the Apostle should rely upon the work of another for the entire framework of this narrative."

No doubt, as Dr. J. A. Robinson remarks, "If a modern writer were to act thus we should give it the harsh name of plagiarism . . . but in the age with which we are dealing such appropriations were considered perfectly legitimate."²

But although some of our greatest Biblical scholars are convinced that St. Matthew and St. Luke had before them, as they wrote, the existing Gospel according to St. Mark, this cannot be accepted as a proved fact, and some of the divergencies and omissions are very difficult to explain on this hypothesis.

How far this is true can only be ascertained by a careful and elaborate examination of parallel passages. But a glance at that part of Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*, where the Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels is set forth, will show that it is quite easy to exaggerate the proportion of common matter. For instance, in the parallels, Mark iv. 35-41, Matthew viii. 18, 23-27, less than half is common matter, and some of the changes are unaccountable on the hypothesis of a written copy lying under the eye of the Evangelist. Why, for example, should St. Matthew change St. Mark's report of the words addressed to our Lord: *Διδάσκαλε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα*; to *Κύριε, σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα*? St. Luke's report of the same cry has all the marks of independent inquiry: *Ἐπιστάτα, Ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύμεθα*. Again why should St. Matthew prefer

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. lxxx.

² *The Study of the Gospels*, p. 28.

σεισμὸς μέγας to the Homeric λαίλαψ μεγάλη ἀνέμου of St. Mark ? And where did St. Luke get his still more vigorous κατέβη λαίλαψ ἀνέμου if not from a distinct authority ? In many other cases the correspondence is close, as in the parallels Mark viii. 1-9 and Matthew xv. 32-39. And in some the single occurrence of a rare verbal form incontestibly proves a common source, as the occurrence of ἀπεκατεστάθη in the parallels, Mark iii. 5, Matthew xii. 13, Luke vi. 10.

But this phenomenon of likeness and unlikeness, difficult of explanation on the supposition of a Marcan original, is precisely the result to be expected from an oral catechetical Gospel. That such was at any rate the beginning of the Gospel, we know from the account of the early Church given in Acts ii. 42, where we are told that the disciples continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine (διδασχῆ), which must have been centred in a narrative of the words and acts of Jesus, which for the purpose of transmission, and for assisting the memory of hearers, would presently assume a more or less fixed form. Now it cannot be doubted that St. Matthew was himself one of these Apostolic lecturers or teachers in the first days of the Church in Jerusalem ; one, therefore, to whom the *logia* discoverable in St. Mark's Gospel may in part be due. Nor is there anything in the Gospel attributed from the earliest ages to St. Matthew to make it unlikely to have formed the substance of his teaching at Jerusalem. That teaching may have been, and probably was, enlarged and enriched by the acquisition of other recollections, many of which in all probability came from St. Peter through the Marcan *logia*.

Such a conclusion, it seems to the present writer, would satisfy both the contents of tradition and the requirements of modern synoptical research. Both are deserving of respect. It is certainly not a time to treat lightly the voice of an ancient and undisputed tradition when in other fields

of research the tendency is not to discard but to confirm and verify the existence of legendary things and ancient civilizations. The throne of Minos and the arts of Crete are significant witnesses to the trustworthiness of tradition.

II. Apart from the question of authenticity there is another point on which we trust that the conclusions of recent criticism on the first Gospel will not be received without careful reconsideration. It is a point of literary appreciation. Our contention is that whether St. Matthew himself or some other gifted disciple of Christ composed this Gospel, the work which he accomplished entitles him to rank not as a mere "editor" or "redactor" but as an original writer of pre-eminent skill and influence. It is true, as has been observed above, that a great part of the Gospel is composed of matter common to St. Mark and St. Luke. That was inevitable in a work of this description. No disciple of Christ would essay to write a Gospel without endeavouring to incorporate the *ipsissima verba* of his Master. He would go to the highest sources possible. The probability that such sources may have been, in part at least, St. Matthew's own recollections has been suggested. But, as we have seen, incorporation of original documents was the usage of the time. It no more detracts from the originality of authorship than the use made by Virgil or Horace, or by Dante, or even by Shakespeare and Gibbon and by successive English historians of the authorities often quoted verbatim by those distinguished and original authors in their poems or historical narratives.

On this point it is of interest to cite some remarks of the late Professor Conington in his Introduction to Virgil. *Mutatis mutandis* they are closely applicable to the subject of this paper: "There is something almost unexampled in the state of feeling which at Rome, and in the Augustan age in particular, allowed palpable and avowed imitation

to claim the honour of poetic originality. . . . Striking as the phenomenon is, the circumstances of the case enable us readily to account for it. The Roman knew only of a single instance of a national literature in the world: it challenged his allegiance with an undisputed claim, and his only course seemed to be to conform to it, and endeavour, so far as he could, to reproduce it among his own people. . . . And yet there can be no doubt that Virgil ranked as an original poet in his own judgment no less than in that of his contemporaries, and that on the strength of these very appropriations, which would stamp a modern author with the charge of plagiarism.”¹ Like the Roman poet the Christian Evangelist had one source alone, which he was bound to incorporate in his work; and like him does not thereby lose his claim to originality. For what constitutes originality in the author, and places him above the rank of “editorship” or “redaction” is the way in which he groups and presents his facts, and brings them to bear on the purpose for which the work was undertaken. And the test of originality is the impression created by the work, and its influence on succeeding generations. *Securus judicat* holds good of the *ordo saeculorum* as well as of the *orbis terrarum*. And both verdicts have been secured by St. Matthew. The Gospel which bears his name possesses that indefinable distinction which has given it an influence proper only to works of genius, or, as it is competent for us in this case to say, to inspired literature.

¹ *Vergili Opera*. Conington, vol. i. pp. 4 and 6. Compare also in reference to Dante: “Dante est un génie double, à la fois éclectique et original. . . . Vous voyez bien qu’il n’a rien créé, ou plutôt il a tout créé. C’est de la sorte que précèdent les inventeurs: chacun suit les éléments, dont ils se servent, personne ne sait le secret de leur mise en œuvre.” Labitte, *La Divine Comédie avant Dante*. (Cited in Longfellow’s translation of Dante, pp. 735, 736.)

It is indeed impossible to substantiate these points in the course of a short paper, but among the notes of originality and independence in the use of common matter may be named : definiteness of purpose ; grouping of subject matter ; choice of incidents and notes on their special significance in relation to the purpose of his Gospel.

The Gospel of St. Matthew is essentially a Gospel of the Kingdom. The Christ therein described is born King of the Jews, the promised heir of the house of David, who fulfils the prophetic picture of the world-wide kingdom of heaven, who triumphs in Jerusalem and reigns upon the cross.

Again, this Gospel is a message to the Jews explaining to them the true realization of their national destiny in Christ and the refutation of the false ideals and aspirations which had been set before them by their spiritual guides.

A comparison of parallelisms, with a word added here and a phrase omitted there, will show originality and purpose in St. Matthew's mode of presenting incidents. But it is perhaps in this Evangelist's manner of grouping sayings of our Lord and incidents in His life that the secret of his genius chiefly lies. Such juxtaposition focuses the teaching or emphasizes a particular aspect of our Lord's life and character with a concentrated force which has pressed the lesson home on countless generations. It will be sufficient to note three examples of this characteristic of St. Matthew's style : The Parables of the Kingdom in chapter *xiii.* ; the denunciation of the Pharisees in chapter *xxiii.* ; and above all the masterly exposition of our Lord's teaching in St. Matthew's report of the Sermon on the Mount, equally a mark of evangelistic genius, whether we are to record it as an inspired recollection or as a disciple's ordered statement of doctrine collected from sayings uttered on different occasions.

No argument, such as has been attempted in this paper,

can be considered complete without a full and careful examination of the text of the Gospel and citations to prove the points adduced ; but perhaps what has been advanced may lead some to hesitate before rejecting St. Matthew's claim to the authorship of the Gospel or to its rank as a work of original, if inspired genius. ARTHUR CARR.

MARRIAGE PROBLEMS AT CORINTH.

(1 CORINTHIANS VII. ETC.)

THE letter which the Corinthian church had addressed to St. Paul about its difficulties probably began with the topic of marriage ; at any rate, it is in connexion with that problem that the Apostle first makes mention of the letter (1 Cor. vii. 1). There had been much difference of opinion at Corinth. If they could have brought their own wise heads into agreement, they would not have troubled their founder with questions ; their words breathe no spirit of modesty. Usually, emphasis has been laid upon the probable drift of Corinthian opinion towards ascetic condemnation of marriage ; lately, however, Professor Sir W. Ramsay has argued that there must have been a party at Corinth who desired to impose marriage as a universal duty, and that St. Paul's decisions are mainly intended to bring that party to a better mind. We may content ourselves with recognizing that there must have been extreme antagonisms in Corinthian opinion, and that it is hardly likely any of the brethren had hit the precise happy mean which St. Paul indicates, or even that other central line which modern Protestantism might prefer. And we might describe the extreme Corinthian views as follows : on the one hand, a party holding that *marriage is dangerous if not polluting* ; on the other hand, an "enlightened" party holding that *celibacy is contemptible*.

The very first words of chapter vii. give St. Paul's answer to the latter view. Christian celibacy is not contemptible; it is or it may be admirable; at its best, it is distinctly preferable to marriage. The last of these statements perhaps is not plainly included in *v.* 1, but subsequent recurrences to the theme (*vv.* 7, 8, 32, etc.) leave us in no doubt that St. Paul so judged. Protestants can hardly welcome that decision. Still, we must bow to facts; it is a fact that St. Paul held and encouraged that belief. And even the Protestant mind can discover, if it will, points of sympathy with the Pauline view. Enlightened scorn for celibacy takes at the best a physiological view of human nature. It considers man as an animal, framed like other healthy living creatures for continuing the species. Celibacy, therefore, is failure, and wilful celibacy ridiculous. That type of enlightenment agrees with Mr. Rudyard Kipling's Indian critic, who describes the unmarried ladies of Great Britain as "the barren women." If a spiritual view of man is introduced, all the values are changed. Even on the human side, "more" may be "the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife." The unwedded may have in God's house and within His walls, "a memorial and a name better than of sons and of daughters." Like the great suffering Servant, such a one even in death may "see his seed," and "the pleasure of the Lord prospering" in his hands. *There be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake.*

On the other hand, in reply to the persons who despised or distrusted marriage, St. Paul quotes three authorities. First we may name the teaching of Jesus, forbidding divorce. Secondly, there is the prudential consideration, that, if wholesale celibacy is enacted, there will ensue a series of ghastly moral breakdowns, worse than marriage even on

the most unfavourable view of marriage that can be taken. Thirdly, there is the great principle of abiding in the condition in which God called one. Converting grace had come to Corinth, and had won a welcome partly from the wedded, partly from the single. Now the grace of God, which comes not to destroy but rather to fulfil, formulates no demand that men or women should forsake the outward framework of their lives. What they have to do is to fill it with a new spirit. The wedded are to remain wedded, but they are to be henceforth Christian man and Christian wife. The single are to remain single, but they are to be henceforth pure and Christian celibates. In these different paths of life, where God's grace found them, with its wonderful illumination and its new springs of power—there they are to live on; there from henceforth they are to glorify God. This third principle is plainly a lofty moral and Christian thought, though we may be staggered to see how wide a sweep St. Paul gives it. It takes the form it does partly because of his conviction of the imminence of the second Advent. Evidence in support of this statement will appear as we proceed.

Let us now turn to the special issues or detailed problems, either suggested to St. Paul, or distinguished by him in his own handling of the general question.

We may hold that in verses 1-7 St. Paul deals with the married. This has not generally been admitted. It has been supposed that the Apostle starts off with the general problem of sex relations, particularizing at a later point. But what absurd conclusions that view involves! According to it, St. Paul lays down the following general theses: (1) Celibacy is ideally preferable, *v.* 1; (2) safety, however, requires a universal policy of marriage—"let each man have his own wife," etc., *v.* 2; (3) the unmarried are, if possible, to continue unmarried, *v.* 8; (4) the incon-

continent must marry, *v.* 9. We need impute no such confusion and self-contradiction to St. Paul if we realize that at *v.* 8 he passes to a new class, and by consequence that verses 1-7 must have dealt with the class of the married. Hence, too, we infer that a tide of ascetic feeling had risen so high at Corinth as to make a certain section of the church propose a dissolution of marriage relationships. St. Paul forbids this: Let each man have—i.e. live with—his own wife. By way of permission (*vv.* 5, 6), he encourages temporary separations for the purpose of special devotion. But these separations must take place by agreement, and with careful limitation in point of time. All this set of verses is ruled by the practical or prudential motive. It is *unsafe* to break up marriages. Only when he turns back a second time to the married, at verses 10 and 11, does the Apostle recall Christ's words forbidding divorce, which he treats as laying down the same law suggested by prudence to his own mind. As it is not safe, so it is not lawful for married persons to repudiate their obligations; Christ forbids it.—It seems plain that St. Paul's permission (*v.* 6) is the permission to set apart special seasons for uninterrupted communion with God. He cannot possibly describe the whole passages 1-7 as permissive. The earlier verses assume plainly the tone of command: "Let each man"—i.e., as we have argued, each person already married—"have his own wife, and each wife her husband."¹

Verses 8 and 9 introduce a second case, that of the persons converted in a state of celibacy. If they can persevere in a virtuous celibate life, that course will be the best; he

¹ Paul, in describing himself (*v.* 7) as superior to sex cravings, negatives the characteristic R.C. view that his "stake in the flesh" (2 Cor. xii. 7) was of the nature of a sensual suggestion. Paul was no quietist, and he had ten thousand troubles in life. Nay more; like a wise man he stood on guard against the approach of sensual temptation (1 Cor. ix. 27). But this was not among his actual troubles. Here he stood clear.

has already laid down his principle at *v.* 1 and again at *v.* 7, though the explanation why he so greatly prefers celibacy is to come later (*vv.* 32, etc.). If, however, the converts cannot persevere in the single life without incurring temptation, then the maxim of safety comes into play, bidding them marry (*v.* 9), as already it has taken its part in commanding the married not to break off relations with each other. Summing up later at *v.* 17, he brings into prominence the maxim of *abiding as one was called*. True, it may be needful to study safety ("as the Lord hath distributed unto each man"; compare *v.* 7: "Each hath his own gift from God"). But, if possible, loyalty to the condition in which grace found one is to determine duty; "As God hath called." This latter maxim is a universal principle of the Pauline churches (*v.* 17), and has various applications. The converted Jew is to remain a Jew, though a Christian Jew (*v.* 18). It is foreign to the spirit of the passage to suppose that St. Paul is merely discouraging the surgical operation by which the marks of the Jewish rite were effaced. That is literally what he says, but he must take the word in a wider metaphorical sense. Each man is to continue what he was when called by grace; and so the Jew is to be a Jew still.—Perhaps it should be allowed that St. Paul is a shade carried away by his argument at this point. Personally at least he felt as a Christian that he was "not himself under the law," and only by a loving accommodation accepted its requirements from time to time (*ix.* 20). Whoever can and must speak thus, is scarcely what Jews call a Jew.—Correspondingly, the converted Gentile is to be a Christian Gentile (*v.* 18). Again (*v.* 21) the converted slave is to remain a Christian slave; it is possible that St. Paul qualifies this advice in the closing part of the verse, but it is also possible to hold that he intensifies the advice;

and perhaps that more difficult rendering carries out better the spirit of the passage. If the Lord's coming were so near (see verses 29-31), might it not seem that slavery was indeed an adiaphoron, and that the man who clung to it was the more fully loyal to converting grace? The table of Family Relationships (Eph., Col.; comp. also 1 Peter) includes Husband and Wife, Father and Child, Master and Slave. So early did the Christian church come to embrace slave owners as well as their proprietary articles male and female. And so calmly did an apostle of Christ recognize facts. What does outward slavery or what does outward freedom matter (*v.* 22) in comparison with the Christian freedom and again with the Christian servitude which are the blessing and glory of every true disciple? ¹

The third class contemplated are of the nature of a special sub-class—married persons whose marriages are what we call “mixed.” Probably the marriages in question had not been “mixed” at the first; one would not willingly suppose that even at Corinth Christian men or Christian women had married out of “the Lord” (compare *v.* 39). At first, then, these marriages had been heathen—unmixedly heathen. But converting grace, when it drew near, had shown itself eclectic. One partner was taken and one left. The husband had become a Christian while his wife remained a Pagan; or the wife had learned to love Christ, while the husband continued outside the faith. This was a state of matters of which Jesus on earth had had no cognizance; and St. Paul sharply contrasts the case which Jesus definitely settled—a normal marriage relation between two wor-

¹ It might be possible to interpret *v.* 23—“*Become not* (R.V.) servants of men” as discouraging the passing of a Christian into servitude. To become a slave would have everything against it. It would not only be a social loss but an act of disobedience to the spiritual intimations afforded by converting grace. However, it is probable that at verse 23 St. Paul is allegorizing, and is warning fanatical adherents of human masters—Paul, Apollos, Cephas—that they are really slaves of men.

shippers of the true God—from this other and seeming doubtful case, where the two who are one have a barrier between them which penetrates to the depths of their being, and rises to the heights of heaven. Even in this case, St. Paul forbids any dissolution of the marriage by the action of the Christian partner. Its continuance might well seem doubtful. If all marriages were suspected things in certain quarters at Corinth, how much more the continuance of marriage with an unbeliever! But St. Paul gives the assurance that there is no possibility of pollution here. God—so we may fill in his hints—has called a soul to serve Him; but the new and supreme duty does not cancel the older and lower yet truly sacred duty of wife to husband or of husband to wife. Whatever disturbance a one-sided Christian faith brings to such a marriage, yet the marriage relationship itself becomes more than ever a holy thing. Vicariously, the Christian partner blesses or consecrates the non-Christian, just as a Christian parent consecrates or makes holy his offspring,¹ though born to the inheritance of sin. Here, as B. Weiss says, we have no trace of infant baptism, but we have the line of thought indicated which makes infant baptism inevitable in the future. Thus the mixed marriage is a very special case of duty found in existence, recognized, elevated, by the grace of God. Henceforth faithfulness towards the other partner involves not simple loyalty or kindness, but, if it be possible, the greater benefaction—to “save” the as yet unconverted husband or wife! A very arduous but also very glorious vocation surely, this vocation of a mixed marriage blindly and innocently contracted. The Christian partner, cheered by that

¹ Surely Paul does not mean the special Christian parent who is joined in mixed marriage to a heathen! Doubt as to the imputed consecration of a heathen partner could hardly be removed by a reference to half-heathen progeny.

wonderful hope, is to continue dwelling with the unconverted partner. But, on the other hand, if a breach comes from the side of the unconverted partner, it is to be acquiesced in. God, in such a case, while refusing the supreme blessedness of "saving" the other, has granted the great if inferior blessedness of "peace"—a life no longer cruelly distracted, but henceforth wholly for Christ and for His people. No Christian is to raise difficulties about such a divorce. That would be running beyond duty. They cannot tell, after all, whether many more years of the mixed marriage and of the distracted home would have been crowned with the "saving" of the unconverted one. St. Paul names that hope as a thing so uncertain—"How *knowest* thou?"—that Christians may thankfully be freed from mixed marriages where they innocently can. If we had to render "How knowest thou whether thou shalt not *save*" the other, the next verse (17) could not begin with an adversative "only," but must be introduced by such a word as "therefore." It is by mere implication that St. Paul sets before the mixed marriages which remain undissolved the high and inspiring hope of gaining for Christ an unconverted partner.—Upon this passage, wisely or unwisely, many systems of law—e.g., that of Scotland—have established the right of divorce on the ground of desertion.

Verses 25-40 deal with a fourth case—the case of young virgins. This case has two peculiarities. First, it cannot well be settled by the principle of abiding as when called to Christ. Conversion had found many of the Corinthians in childhood; but even in a year or two, in the course of nature, the boy becomes a man and the young girl a marriageable maiden.¹ There is no need for St. Paul to say anything

¹ This must be the sense of *ὑπέρακμος* (v. 36), if only because there had not been time for the belles of the Corinthian church to become

further about the boy. The rules already laid down (*vv.* 8, 9) apply directly to him. He is to keep single if he can—to marry if he must; he is his own master. But the maiden is in a different position. She is emphatically, in that age and land, a being not at her own disposal. And this constitutes the second peculiarity of the new question to be discussed. It is hard to accept for oneself such a taxing ideal as celibacy, yet it may be easier to do that than to thrust it upon others. We cannot wonder if the Corinthians asked St. Paul how they were to act towards their daughters. On the whole, St. Paul declines to modify the positions he has already laid down. His language is more delicate and reserved, but his thought is unchanged.

In a sense, he so modifies or expands the principle of “abiding as called” that it stretches even to the new case. There is a “present distress” which speaks more loudly against marriage than the voice of nature can plead for it. What is meant by this “distress”? There was no persecution at the moment when St. Paul wrote our First Epistle; had there been, it must have left unmistakable traces on his thought and on his words. The conception is a theological one; more precisely, it is eschatological. “The Lord is at hand”; and the troubles which surround all Christians are the signs of His near coming. *Judgment must begin at the house of God*; it will soon take the significant form of persecution. The career of the Gospel is to be no smooth optimistic progress, but a drama, a battle, a tragedy. Growing love to God and Christ will be matched elsewhere by growing hatred.

Granting this analysis of the situation, we may feel a lessened surprise at St. Paul’s decision. It would please him well to hear that there were no marriages at all in

passées, although time enough had elapsed to bring some of the young girls to womanhood.

prospect among the young people of the Corinthian church. Recognizing frankly that that is impossible, he yet clings to the hope that the marriages will be very few. And what wonder, upon the assumption he makes? There are seasons and circumstances in which a purpose of marriage must mean either great heroism or great frivolity; and, in most communities—not to say specially in such a community as Corinth—frivolity is a more probable factor than heroism. At its best, how pathetic a thing is any marriage, in spite of all the shouting we make over it! To launch a new family upon the uncharted sea of human life ought to be the work of sober courage. And yet, is not Christian faith a fountain of such courage? All that St. Paul can say about the alarms and sorrows of wedded life is in a sense permanently true. The wider we make the circle of those very dear to us, the more numerous become the “hostages” we have given to “fortune,” and the points where sorrow can strike right home to our hearts. A life full of interests is also full of cares. A heart filled with love must be filled with fears—so precious a treasure in such frail vessels. Yet assuredly the Christian, *ceteris paribus*, will prefer the full life to the empty. It is unbelieving, it is anti-Christian—Buddhist perhaps it may be!—to insure against sorrow by narrowing our affections. But the last word on the whole matter is what St. Paul himself would say—that no life is really empty where God is present, and no life really full where God is absent. Unless we ought still further to add—what again surely corresponds to the spirit if not to the letter of St. Paul’s teaching—that the fuller life is good *where God grants it*. “Each man hath his own gift from God.”

It is needful that we should clearly realize the helpless pupillage of these Corinthian maidens. As a wife, the Corinthian woman has legal opportunity (*v.* 10) to divorce

her husband ; St. Paul quotes against such conduct Christ's words in a form like that in Mark's Gospel¹ (Mark x. 12), which applies to Gentile as well as to Jewish conditions—to divorces initiated by the woman as well as by the man. Again, as a widow (*v.* 39) the Corinthian lady had both legal and moral right, according to St. Paul, to make her free choice between remarriage or continued widowhood. In Hinduism, the woman is always in a state of vassalage ; Greek or Hellenistic ideas seem to have made marriage a veritable emancipation for her, leaving the unmarried girl to servitude. Nor does St. Paul criticize these ideas ; probably he shares them. The girl's wish, to marry or not to marry, is never once referred to. It constitutes no element in the case. Perhaps St. Paul assumed that she was sure to prefer marriage unless older and wiser persons could give her better guidance. What wonder if she did wish to marry ? What else had she to look forward to ? She was to say her prayers, apparently, and be happy in that occupation during the brief space of time till the fabric of this world had dissolved away (*vv.* 31 and 34). The problem, the duty, the burden, is one for her guardian,² i.e., normally for her father. The only way in which she can force his hand is a deplorable one ; if he is convinced that she cannot safely live single, he is to let her marry. It is exactly the teaching of verse 9 over again. Both with man and woman, St. Paul is convinced, godliness is more likely to flourish in celibacy than in marriage (*vv.* 32–34). Wedded love competes dangerously against that supreme

¹ We might suppose that St. Paul was generalizing the principle of our Lord's teaching. But the anxious and precise way in which he contrasts two authorities—"the Lord, not I" ; "I, not the Lord"—points rather to his knowing the tradition of Christ's words in this modified shape.

² Whatever the language may admit, the context is decisive against supposing that the author of verses 1–7 recognized anything of the nature of the later bizarre and hateful system of *subintroductæ*.

love which saves. Hence he *advises*—a “counsel” of perfection (comp. Matt. xix. 21), as the Catholic churches call it—celibacy wherever possible. And he “thinks” that he is a spiritual man, no less than his enlightened censors at Corinth (*v.* 40 ; comp. xiv. 37).

When we inquire into the modern Protestant attitude towards marriage problems, it is obvious that the whole situation changes with our changed eschatology. The world has lasted some eighteen and a half centuries since St. Paul wrote ; plainly therefore it was not and is not God’s purpose that we should construe duty in terms of the imminence of Judgment Day. But a change in our moral conceptions is even more important. The slow working of Christianity, along with that of other elements of civilization, has produced the ideals of romantic love ; and we cannot get away from these. We must not exaggerate their value. A marriage “arranged” for a virtuous young couple upon the French system does not on the average work out so differently as we might suppose from a marriage directly due to personal choice. Nor must we ignore the dangers of romance. Fickleness and frivolity constantly claim the privileges of true love, and secure them only to abuse and discredit them. Yet upon the whole the advance is real, is immense ; and even a St. Paul who leaves out romantic love from his calculations leaves out one of the central points, and must rank in part as obsolete. If love is what sanctifies marriage, it is not possible to treat marriage as a panacea for the sexually weak. There are innumerable conjunctions of circumstance which may shut up Christian man or Christian woman to a virtuous celibate life. Because they “must” lead it, they “can.” A marriage may be within legal and technically within moral limits ; but, unaccompanied by love, marriage is a shameful thing. We have come to see that, and must accept the

responsibility of what we have learned. Also, of course, it is impossible now to think of marrying off any persons, or of constraining any sane and healthy adults to a single life, against their own wishes.

It is evident that St. Paul, with all his wealth of knowledge and spiritual insight, was a one-sided child of his age in his blindness to the higher ideal glories of marriage.¹ But it might be a hasty inference to say that he undervalues woman. Does he underrate woman any more than he underrates man? Is it not rather a whole side of human life upon earth which he fails to understand? And yet how much he has been taught! It is part of St. Paul's historic greatness that he accepts given conditions and works upon these. He had no call to construct social Utopias, and go wandering into the land of "Nowhere." God was to construct Utopia Himself—very soon—at Christ's second Advent. Meantime, St. Paul works *everywhere*; he becomes "all things to all men, that he may by all means save *some*," as he writes with a terrible sobriety of outlook. It was perhaps a dangerous policy. Our flippant application of the phrase, when we describe very supple persons as being "all things to all men," suggests how the policy may degenerate. But St. Paul himself carried it out with noble self-forgetfulness, and with the practical wisdom which accepts men, so far as possible, as they are. And the God of St. Paul granted to him the joy of saving not "some" only, but multitudes. On his own assumptions, too, how masterly, how perfect is his handling of the Corinthian problems! If a twentieth century Christian could have talked to the Corinthians about the glories of true love, he might only have bewildered them and made the confusion greater than ever.

¹ Unless we ought to accept the claim sometimes put forward, that by the time he wrote Eph. v. 22-33 his mind had ripened.

On one question of fact, long Christian experience joins issue with St. Paul. Making full allowance for the self-sacrificing services of Christian maidenhood, we do not find in Christian matrons the spiritual inferiority which St. Paul feared. Only those who are riding a theory to death could pretend to detect any such thing. The Catholic churches, of course, are in the grip of such a theory and have no choice. But Protestants are free to see things and persons as they really are. We do not find marriage a secularizing influence on our mothers or our wives. We find it to be their gift from God, sanctified to the Christian heart, inferior to none.

That being so, must we face the question whether, in other respects, St. Paul did misconstrue or undervalue the woman's gifts? The modern woman movement may be compelled to answer "yes." It has broken fresh ground. Romanticism or chivalry, at its best, sees new depths in love and marriage, and in the heart of woman as man's lover and helpmeet. But the modern movement is half inclined to suspect servitude in marriage, and takes more interest in securing independent careers for women. In a word, it carries on the fuller assimilation of man and woman. Now St. Paul is against this. Yet at other times he seems to furnish a programme for the movement. It is as if he fought upon both sides. In parallel cases, too, he carries out his theoretic principles to unexpected practical results. There was no more Jew or Gentile in Jesus Christ; but just because the distinctions were adiaphora, they might last as external customs; and St. Paul thought they ought to do so. There was no more bond or free—and yet, here again, the outward institution lives on, and Onesimus must return to Philemon. There is no more male or female in Christ: that principle, clearly announced by St. Paul (Gal. iii. 28), may justify any revolutionary innovations

in the way of equality between the sexes. And yet for St. Paul himself Christianity confirms the relative distinction of the sexes, and even implies the greater technical nearness of the man to God than of the woman (1 Cor. xi. 3).

History has worked out other points of the Pauline programme to issues which he did not formulate. Jewish Christians have long ceased to exist as Jews; slavery within Christendom is all but entirely unknown. Shall we say that the Apostle was wrong when he took the social distinction between men and women for a permanent thing? Is abstract and absolute equality the real meaning of Christianity as applied to sex, or is it not?

The question is too hard to be answered by this writer, and too complex to be discussed in a closing paragraph. But that, in all its hardness and complexity, is the issue raised for us to-day, not merely by the dame- and damosel-errants of Female Suffrage but by many calmer spirits. Is it prejudice, or is it principle, which has restricted the Christian ministry itself in all the greater communions to men? Must we look forward to Christian ladies presiding at the Lord's Table? There are those who could do that well, if it be a lawful thing; I do not think any well-conditioned male Christian will either contend in speech, or think in his heart, that he and his fellows are essentially nearer to God or to the pattern set by our Lord Jesus Christ than Christian women are. And yet—is that to lead to our blurring the separation, in politics or in religion, between the two sexes? St. Paul vehemently dissents. He speaks (in 1 Cor. xi.) like one feeling about for arguments to support an instinct, and to justify a foregone conclusion. Many of the arguments may leave us unmoved; but can we possibly despise the instinct, in such a man as St. Paul? Or was it only a case of the earthen vessel slightly tainting the divine treasure? It is indeed a hard question, but it clamours for an answer.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

*THE PROBLEM OF THE EPISTLES TO THE
THESSALONIANS.*

THE ordinary reader of the Thessalonian Epistles finds them interesting, comforting, stimulating. They bear on their face all signs of genuineness. The tender affection of St. Paul for the loved Church that he had founded amid much tribulation glows in his words. His teaching is comparatively simple ; there is no very deep penetration into Divine mysteries. Doctrine is of a simple kind ; it seems to sound the same chord as the Apostles' Creed. The Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost are here. The death and Resurrection and future coming of Christ are here. But beyond these there is little dogma or redemptive doctrine, No one turns to these Epistles to learn clearly the way of salvation, the secret of the forgiveness of sins. Prayer is here, and praise is here ; the laws of holiness, the duty of order, and of submission to authority ; the sin of neglecting work. Such are the themes. They harmonize exactly with the Christian teaching of other Pauline writings ; and yet we feel that they do not go as deeply down into the strata of experience or of the work of God's grace as all the other Epistles. There is a certain elementary character in the teaching which does not fail to impress itself. Jesus Christ is here the historic Person, not the Head of the Body, in Whom we are united to God and to one another.

Similarly, in the opening address, St. Paul is not "the Apostle of Jesus Christ," as in nearly all his other letters, but only the personal teacher whom they knew and loved.

All this elementariness and simplicity harmonizes well with the fact, which is easily determined and is admitted, that the Thessalonian Epistles are the earliest of St. Paul's letters. So far as we know, he wrote no letters to the Churches which he founded on his first missionary journey.

And as to the second, while the Churches of Galatia and Philippi were founded before that of Thessalonica, they were not addressed by letter till a later date—in the case of Galatia some four years later, in the case of Philippi at least twelve years.

So there is a harmony between the features presented by the Epistle and the chronological facts which we gather elsewhere; nor is there anything in the style or language or the character of the thought to arouse any suspicion adverse to the Pauline authorship.

And yet, viewed from another point, these Epistles present us with a problem which seems, when it is once appreciated, one of some difficulty. So long as we have in our minds only a vague idea that these letters were written to the Thessalonian Church some years after the planting of that Church, as is the case in all the other Epistles, we feel that everything fits well with this view. It is only when accurate study forces upon us the two following facts that we become conscious that there is a difficulty to be overcome.

1. The first fact is that, according to the Acts (chap. xvii.), the planting of the Church—mainly a Gentile Church, at Thessalonica, was extremely rapid. A very short interval lay between the time when Thessalonica was worshipping idols (chap. i. 9), and the time when the Church of Thessalonica was worshipping Christ, and not only that, but anxiously looking for His appearing. “Ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for His Son from Heaven, even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come.”

When we compare the slow and tedious processes of mediæval and modern missions to the heathen with that sudden triumph of the Cross within a period which at first sight, it would appear, was limited by a few weeks,

we are startled. We turn from one explanation to another. We ask, was this thing altogether supernatural? or, is St. Paul exaggerating the marvel of their conversion? or, is the writer of the Acts, ignorant of the real chronology, condensing a long period into the space of a few weeks?

Both Epistles and history seem to stand the critical test. The journeys of St. Paul, while St. Luke was with him, are given with great accuracy, as also are those in the intervals during which St. Luke was absent on a mission; and there is a straightforwardness about these Epistles which silences all but wanton criticism.

2. But there is a second fact which increases the difficulty presented by the above. The first Epistle was written very soon after St. Paul left Thessalonica; the second, not long after the first. Professor Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*) makes out carefully certain dates, which, though they do not quite agree with those of the older chronology, as represented in Dean Alford's Table in the Introduction to the *Acts*, nevertheless, place the writing of the Epistles as near to the time of the founding of the Church as did the older chronology. According to Professor Ramsay, St. Paul left Thessalonica May, A.D. 51. After his stay at Berea he reached Athens, August, 51; and in October he has arrived at Corinth, and soon Timothy and Silas come to him there from a visit of inspection at Thessalonica, to which they had been specially sent from Athens by the Apostle little more than a month before. And the writing of the first Epistle immediately followed the coming of the messengers. ("When Timothy came *even now*," ἄρτι, "just now," German, *eben jetzt*.) That the writing of the Epistle was early in the Corinthian stay is further shown by the story of the Acts, which requires a year and a half at Corinth after the coming of Timothy. The Apostle, according to Ramsay, left Corinth in March, 53.

Unless, then, St. Luke is confused and unreliable in these statements of time, which he seems to give in a straightforward way, a period of about five or six months only can be allowed to separate the Apostle's leaving Thessalonica and his writing the first Epistle.

It is the careful reading of the contents of that Epistle (we are now dealing with the first only) which introduces the second remarkable fact which rivets our surprised attention. Though, as we have already seen, it is in dogmatic fulness and in other ways less advanced than other Epistles, yet it is evidently written to a community of a remarkably earnest character, and showing no symptoms of raw youth, or of inability to stand alone. The Apostle writes with all the confidence and assurance which he uses in any other Epistle, with the conviction that he is addressing a Church founded securely, ministered to by its own pastors, and developed to a degree which had already commanded the admiration of a wide region which had profited by its earnestness. "For from you hath sounded out the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place your faith to Godward has gone forth, so that we need not to speak anything."

If this be not the language of flattering exaggeration—if it contain sober truth, what are we to think of the astonishing results of this European mission introduced not more than a year and a half before into heathen Macedonia, and only within twelve months into Thessalonica? And this surprise is vastly intensified when we bring together, as we have done, the two facts, that the actual ministry at Thessalonica is described as only one of a few weeks (see Acts xvii. 2, a period which Ramsay calculates may possibly be extended to some five months), and that the Epistle, written but six months after the close of the Thessalonian ministry, addresses a well-known and highly spiritual and energetic Church?

The passage quoted is not the only one which speaks of the wonderful maturity of this infant Church. But if the reader will be good enough to lay down this article and read through that Epistle in its entirety, holding clearly the idea in his mind that it is an Apostolic letter to a Church in which no baptized person was of one year's standing, the impression on his mind will be much stronger than that which could be produced by a selection of quotations.

We shall assume that the reader has now re-perused the Epistle. Similar impressions, impressions in some respects stronger, will be received from a rapid reading of the second Epistle, which must have followed the first after a lapse of but a few months, and while the same companions were still by the writer's side. The second Epistle—save for the curious episode of the Man of Sin (and imagine *that* addressed to a Church of a year's standing, in any mission of the modern Church!)—resembles the first in many ways, utters the same undeveloped language of Christian dogma, but addresses the same living faith in Christ. It warns against the same sin of living "disorderly," chiefly, it would seem, in the direction of allowing ordinary regulated life to be interfered with by excited expectations of the second Advent. (See chap. ii. 1-3 ; iii. 6-11.)

It is when we read of the painfully slow progress of most modern and mediæval missions that our astonishment at this mission reaches its height. Even the rapidity of conversion at Uganda under the labours of the Church Missionary Society is cast into the shade. For first, the period of incubation of the Church in Uganda was much longer ; and secondly, the spiritual development of the baptized Buganda people does not at all resemble that of the Thessalonians. Does any one suppose that these African believers could have been addressed, within a year or so of the first

proclamation of the Gospel in their territories, in words like these: "We exhort you, brethren, to know them that labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake . . . and we beseech you, warn the disorderly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be long-suffering towards all" ? Or again, "Ye are all sons of light and of the day ; we are not of the night or of darkness. . . . Let us who are of the day be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of salvation." It will be allowed that nowhere has a Church been reared from the very first stone and then spiritually developed to the point reached by the Thessalonians within the period, or anything like it, which the Epistle and the Acts indicate in this case.

Does it all seem *incredible*? We confess that for a considerable time, since first realizing the chronological difficulty, it seemed to us that there must be an error somewhere. Are the dates wrong? Was St. Paul much longer at Thessalonica, or did a much longer time elapse before the writing of the letters? But no. The crowded events of the second missionary journey will not allow of an earlier arrival at Thessalonica—the later history will not allow us to postpone the sending of the Epistle. Many reasons seem to make it impossible to assume anything of forgery or deception. We quite dismiss this hypothesis though Baur defended it (see Dr. Salmon's answer to him in his "Introduction"). The peculiar views of the second Advent which belonged to the very first age, the touching anxiety so tenderly alluded to (chap. iv.) as to the fate of those who had died in the interval between their conversion and Christ's expected immediate return, convince the reader that all is genuine here. These delicate touches are not those of a second century forger.

We think, however, that there are circumstances which in some degree mitigate the great difficulty of the problem. The preaching of St. Paul in that city was first in the synagogue. There he was heard by Jews and *religious proselytes*. These had already been drawn out of heathenism, and had been prepared for purer teaching by Jewish influence, while still not sharing the Jewish national spirit. We find among the converts rapidly made at Thessalonica "some of the Jews, of the devout Greeks" (proselytes), "a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few." May it be possible that it was to these devout Greeks that St. Paul wrote, "Ye turned unto God from idols," referring to their previous first step from paganism to monotheism, so that they had already drawn a notable degree nearer to the true position? This would perhaps mitigate the difficulty, but we can scarcely believe that this is the full explanation. We believe that these conversions from idols were in many cases direct, and are led to inquire whether there is room in the narrative for such a mission directly addressed to Gentiles.

We seem to see an interval between verses 4 and 5 of Acts xvii.—an interval which leaves unrecorded that preaching to the heathen which, according to St. Paul's invariable practice, must have taken place. It was probably his success in this mission to those outside which led to the attack on the house of Jason, so suddenly named in the narrative. Of this period, if such there were, we have no record; but it must have been in this period that direct conversions from the heathen took place, as mentioned by St. Paul in the passage quoted from the close of the first chapter of the first Epistle.

There is another mitigation of difficulty in assuming that many of the devout Greeks, and of the pagans as well, may have been not rude, but cultivated and thought-

ful people. The letter does not read as if it had been addressed to ignorant persons, whose mental status must have delayed their appreciation of thoughtful addresses. We are thus enabled, perhaps, somewhat to lessen the difficulty of the rapid founding of the Church.

Not so, however, the difficulty of the great development and fame of the Church within a year of its conversion. That remains on record in the Epistle, and it is indeed an astonishing chapter in Church history.

The reader who is in full sympathy with St. Paul will enter into the feelings of overwhelming joy with which he watched these triumphs in the battle of the Lord. He had been shamefully treated, but had had some real success, at Philippi. He had been mocked and snarled at at learned, haughty Athens; He had begun to feel that Corinth was going to treat him differently. And now the coming of Timothy with authentic news a few days old at most from Thessalonica—that city whose Jewish people were so far less noble than the Bereans—gave him the first real uplifting which he had experienced since the gentle heart of the woman of Thyatira and the manly breast of the Roman jailor had opened to the message of the Lord.

Would he not set all the marvellous work done to the working of the Holy Ghost—that spirit which bloweth where it listeth—which, leaving proud Athens in its ignorance, melted so many hearts at Thessalonica, and led them on so fast towards the condition in which it became, within a year, possible for St. Paul to write thus:—

“ Rejoice evermore ;
Pray without ceasing ;
In everything give thanks ;
Quench not the Spirit ;
Abstain from all appearance of evil ;
And the very God of Peace sanctify you wholly ” ?

This is the solution which satisfies best the terms of the

problem of the Epistles. And this solution will be welcomed most by those who, even if they have never seen great things follow their preaching or teaching, are sure that it is in His power to grant great things still to His Church, and to work wonders, as He did in that ancient city, where the mission of the Apostle within a few short weeks planted a living and prosperous Church by the quays, and in the quaint, overhanging houses of the famous seaport known still to the world as Salonika.

G. R. WYNNE.

THE CLOUD OF UNKNOWING.

AN interesting group of manuscripts, now peacefully resting on the shelves of our English libraries, has scarcely received the attention which it deserves.¹ The treatises in question evince acquaintance with the writings of Dionysius called the Areopagite; they were probably impressed by the mysticism of Eckhart; and they present a distinct form of the doctrine of contemplation. With one exception,² they were never printed; but they received a very wide circulation in England during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; in the words of an old writer, "they walked up and down at deer rates."

Of these tracts the most important are *Deonise hid Diuinite*, a free translation of the *Mystical Theology* of Dionysius; *The Clowde of Unknowynge*, a treatise of contemplation in seventy-five chapters; *A Pystle of Pryvate Councelle*; *A Pistle of Praier*; *A Tretyse of discrecion in knowyng of spirites*; *A Pystle of discrecion in styrrynges*. Of these the first four are certainly, the others probably, by the same hand. Tanner attributes *The Clowde of Unknowynge* to Walter Hilton and William Exmeuse, but it is evidently earlier: it marks a middle point between Rolle and Hilton. We may date this series after the middle of the fourteenth century.

When Rolle of Hampole, "burning in love to God," was itinerating Yorkshire, with the praises of Jesus upon his lips, Ambrose, a Cistercian monk, was diligently studying the *Mystical Theology* of Dionysius (at Fountains Abbey, as it would appear), and being dissatisfied with the renderings

¹ MSS. Harl. 674; Bibl. Reg. 17 C. 26; Univ. Coll. Ox. 14; Cam. Kk. vi. 26; etc.

² The *Cloud of Unknowing* has been edited as a manual of devotion by Father Collins.

of Erugena and Grosseteste, was turning it into good Church Latin.¹ Another monk from the same monastery, and of the same period, Lewis by name, afterwards influenced the young thought of Walter Hilton,² author of the *Scale of Perfection*, and chief of English contemplationists. It is probable that the sheaf of treatises to which we have now drawn attention proceeded from that northern House of Religion. The sons of St. Benedict have particularly devoted themselves to the life of contemplation. However that may be, the manuscripts before us mark the first undoubted tendency to pure mysticism in English theology.

Deonise hid Diuinite is the first translation into English of any of the writings of the Areopagite. The author of the *Clowde of Unknowynge* appends it to that treatise as a certificate of orthodoxy. It is enough for him, enough too for his readers, that "Dionyse sentence will clearly affirm all that is written." He adds, "I have not set down the naked letter of the text, but for to declare the hardness of it, I have much allowed the sentence of the Abbot of St. Victor,³ a noble and worthy expositor of this same book." The "hardness of it" is very much softened in this interpretation, and Dionysius becomes a tolerably good Augustinian. He is represented as speaking in this strain :

Thou, friend Timothy, what time thou proposet thee by the striving of grace to the actual exercise of thy blind beholdings, see that thou forsake with a strong and lusty contrition both thy bodily wits, as hearing, seeing, smelling, tasting, and touching ; and also

¹ See MS. Line. Coll. Ox. 49, "Absolvi Ambrosius Dionysii opuscula . . . anno . . . 1346." This Ambrose is not to be confounded with Ambrosius Camaldulensis.

² See MS. Lamb. 472, fol. 213b.

³ Hugh was teacher, Richard was prior ; neither was abbot of St. Victor. The reference is apparently to Richard.

thy ghostly wits, thus assorting thyself from the understandable working might of the soul, and from the objects of them ; that is to say, all the things in which they work. By this means thou shalt make thyself clean from all worldly, fleshly, and kindly liking in thine affection to the sovran substantial beam of the godlike darkness, to be one with Him that is above all being and all man's knowing ; and (in) that thou knowest nothing thou art made to be knowing above mind.

This short extract is enough to show the immense distance which stretches between the ascetic theologians of the fourteenth century and the theosophists of the Syrian cloister. In at least three points of the first importance the "interpreter" of Dionysius qualifies his author. Both agree that the itinerary of the mind towards Deity is along the way of negation ; but to the scheme of the northern monk (*a*) the ascent of the soul becomes possible, not through simple volition but by grace ; (*b*) the mystic purgation is not from sense but from "worldly liking" ; (*c*) the vision opens not to pure thought but to holy affection. Thus, while this professed disciple of Dionysius reports him as saying that the scale of perfection may be surmounted only in a manner that is "invisible and ungroppable," his doctrine does not greatly differ from the dictum of Pascal that "the heart has reasons of its own which reason cannot read."

The *Clowde of Unknowynge* is an application of the Dionysian teaching, thus qualified, to the practice of contemplation as enjoined by the Victorines. One may say that the text of the treatise is the assurance of Dionysius that "the most godly knowing of God is that which is known by unknowing." Near the end of his book the author indicates the chief source of his instruction : "And truly, who would so look St. Denyse books, shall find that his word will thereby affirm all that I have said, or shall say, from the beginning of this treatise to the end."

There are two callings in the Christian life, one to salvation, one to perfection. If thou art called of God to perfection, yield Him thy thanks. What hast thou deserved that thou shouldest be chosen of all His sheep to be special unto Him? But who are they who may travel in this gracious work? Those who have been lawfully cleansed in conscience of all their special deeds of sin; those who have made full special and long use in common grace; those who have departed from mixed life, and have devoted themselves to contemplation.

God giveth His grace freely without means, and perfection may not be come to by means: nevertheless, a contemplative prentice may be occupied with these—Lecture, Meditation, Orison. Of these thou mayest learn in another man's work¹ more than I can tell thee. Yet these are only helps towards the work itself. The work of perfection is the shortest work of all that man can imagine: it is neither longer nor shorter than is an atom. It is a swift piercing act, an act of direction, a naked intent of the will fastening itself upon God. For the substance of all perfection is nought else but a good will.

It is needful for thee to bury in a cloud of forgetting all creatures that ever God made; that thou mayest direct thine intent to God Himself. The naked knowing and feeling of thine own being must likewise be destroyed. But this can only be by special grace. The manner in which grace works I shall now tell thee: Let a man be filled with sorrow, not only of what he is, but also that he is; then let a sharp dart of longing love be directed to God; and in the great joy of loving Him there will be taken from that man all knowing and feeling of his own.

Therefore lift up thine heart unto God with a meek striving of love, and be thou loth to think on ought but on Himself; so that nought work in thy wit nor in thy will but only Himself. When thou dost next begin in this work thou wilt find but a darkness—a cloud of unknowing—between thee and thy Lord, so that thou art able neither to see Him clearly by light of understanding in thy reason, nor feel Him in sweetness of love in thine affection. Yet if ever thou shalt see Him or feel Him—in the measure in which it is possible in this life to do—it behoveth thee always to abide in this cloud and darkness. When thou enterest this cloud, peradventure thou feelest far from God; but thou art nearer Him than formerly: He hath set a darkness between thee and all creatures that ever He made. If any

¹ *A Ladder of foure rones by the which men mowe wele clyme to heaven* (MS. Cam. Ff. vi. 33), a translation of the *Scala Claustralium*, or *Scala Paradisi*, attributed to Abbat Guerrius and Guigo Carthusiensis.

thought, therefore, should come between thee and thy God, then (even though it seem to thee most holy) tread it down with a stirring of love, and say, "It is God whom I covet, whom I seek." Take thee a sharp, strong word of prayer: with this word thou shalt beat down all thoughts under thee. Even to think of God's kindness or worthiness would hinder thee in this work. For though it be good to muse on the perfections of God, and to praise Him therefor, it is far better to think on the native substance of Him, and to love and praise Him for Himself. But now thou askest me, "How should I think on Himself, and what is He?" Unto this I cannot answer thee. I wot now that thou hast brought me into the same cloud of unknowing that I would thou wert in thyself. But this will I say, "By love He may be gotten and holden, but by thought never."

The theory of contemplation unfolded in the *Clowde of Unknowynge* works itself out along the main lines laid down by the doctors of the School of St. Victor. But the author has borrowed from Dionysius more than he can rightly express in Christian phraseology. His acceptance of the untempered doctrine of passive union leads him up to the very margin of Catholic instruction: he is saved from passing it only by a certain inconsistency, and by frequent retractions.

The other treatises in this group (let us except for the moment the *Pystle of Pryvate Councelle*) confirm and supplement the teaching of the *Clowde of Unknowynge*. The doctrine expounded in them is in substance as follows.

The ascent of the soul is rendered possible by faith—"Let belief be thy ground." The severance of the soul from God is not natural distance, it is the consequence of sin—"All men were lost in Adam, who departed from the oneing affection." Hence it is that the attainment of perfection becomes possible only through the goodness of God—"It is not by price, but by grace." God is the principal in working, and man only consentor and sufferer—"Wherefore put on Him by prayer; He is full ready." The union

of man with God does not secure oneness of essence—“God is in Himself; that is onehede in kind: thou art in God, that is onehede in grace. . . . He is thy being, but thou art not His.” It is a moral and spiritual oneness—a union “in lovely meekness and in perfect charity.” It may be termed deification—“If thou love God, thou art God.” But the mystic creed has been pressed into the mould of Church doctrine—man does not become essential God, but only “a God in grace.” Mystical union is ecstasy, ravishment, vision, but always under this proviso—“As it may be here.” It reveals itself not merely in transport, but in symmetrical and far-shining goodness, in illustrious excellence—“in fullhede of love and of virtue’s liking.”

The *Pystle of Pryvate Councelle* should be read along with the *Clowde of Unknowynge*. It is a senior lesson in the school of contemplation: it is addressed to “those who have profited” in the divine life. In this very important treatise the author passes more lightly over the means which contemplative prentices” may use, and endeavours to explain more intimately the nature of “onehede with God.”

When thou comest by thyself forsake as well good thoughts as evil thoughts, and pray not with thy mouth. See that nothing move in thy working mind but a naked intent stretching on to God, not clothed in any special thought of God, how He is in Himself, or in any of His works, but only that He is as He is. This naked intent, freely fastened in very belief, should be nought else to thy thought and thy feeling but a naked thought and a blind feeling of thine own being. Lift up thy naked blind being to the blissful being of thy God. So shall thy ghostly affections be filled with the fulness of God’s liking. The ground of thy spirit and its pureness are found in Him. This is not a long work: it shall be done suddenly, lustily, and graciously, without business or travail of thyself. In this thou shalt henceforth find thine all, for in the blind beholding of thy naked being, now united to God, thou shalt do all that thou doest—eat and drink, sleep and wake, go and sit, speak and be still, lie and rise. Thus shalt thou every day offer up unto God as thy

most precious offering thy soul fully meekened in noughting of itself.

In the beginning of this work I enjoined thee, because of thine unskilfulness, to lap and clothe the feeling of thy God in the feeling of thyself. But when thou dost attain to greater clearness of spirit thou shalt make spoil and utterly unclothe thyself of all manner of feeling of thyself; so shalt thou be clothed with the gracious feeling of God Himself. This is the true condition of a perfect lover, this is the work of love which none may know, this is that attainment which thou shouldest covet straitly. Yet this is not to unbecome—that were madness; nevertheless, it is to forgo the witting and the feeling of thy being. In this thou both seest thy God, thy love, and nakedly feelest Him also by ghostly oncing to His love in the sovran point of thy spirit, as He is in Himself, but blindly—as it may be here—utterly spoiled of thyself, and nakedly clothed in Himself, as He is.

Go forth, therefore, in meek and fervent desire unto perfection. God's grace will guide.

The "cloud of unknowing," the "mirk of ignorance," is of course the *τέφος ἀγνωσίας* of Dionysius. It is a commonplace with the mystics of the East that the eyes which behold the objects of sense and of intelligence must be closed ere spiritual sight can be unsealed. This is the simple meaning of Dionysius "divine dark." Above things seen and known the spiritual world rises, and there the organ of vision is not sense nor reason, but spirit. There the naked spirit of man gazes upon the pure essence of God, is united to Him in immediate contact and adhesion, is filled with the eternal life, is merged in God.

The foundation thought of Dionysius' *Mystical Theology* is that God Himself is the ground of the soul. When in perception or by discourse the soul reaches forth towards creature-existence, it turns from God. But when, by an act of "holy introversion," it renounces the creature and sinks into the fathomless abyss of Deity, it finds its true being. Sense and reason grow blind in the white light of God. The strife of intellectual operations is hushed in the quiescence of undiverted contemplation, and in

“ that simplicity of thought which is devoid of all thinking ”
the soul is restored to oneness with God.

Dionysius finds his way out from this unutterable isolation, not by passing on to the contemplation of all things in the One Being—that was the signal achievement of the Church mystics, under the guidance of St. Paul—but by retracing his steps. He goes back from the contemplation of God to the consideration of creature-existence, from absolute knowledge to relative. It is, he assures us, in this region—of relative knowledge—that the doctrines of Christianity lie. He maintains that these doctrines are true in their degree, but that we must continue to regard them as inadequate. Yet he states them without reserve. He terms Jesus the head and perfection of all Hierarchies ; in Him the truth and fulness of all things are spiritually discerned. He speaks frequently of Christ’s coming, under the impulse of love, from the life of God ; taking to Himself the lowliness of our humanity ; made like to us, yet suffering no deprivation of His Divine excellence ; incarnate, yet uncompounded ; eternal, yet born in time ; transcending all things, yet dwelling in our nature. He affirms that the incarnation, though it surpasses thought or speech, is the most illustrious fact of theology. For, though we may not know how it came to pass, we know well why it was : Christ became flesh for our sakes. His work in seeking the lost sheep, in dying as a victim offered on our behalf, in uniting us to His own being, in leading us onward to His own perfection and glory, is the goodly work of God towards mankind. In Christ God has been manifested to the world for its salvation. All these things, he would say, are true, but the sense-informed reason is unable to apprehend them rightly. Between the two spheres, therefore, in which the faith of the Church operates there is a belt of darkness. By ingress into God

the soul is led into the realization of utter truth, into "the ray authentic of sovran light." By regress to creature-existence we are made aware of truth as it is imaged forth in scripture terms and ecclesiastical formulas. By this continual rhythm between absolute being and finite existence personality is preserved, but the personal life is cleft asunder. So long as the soul which has been "transfused" into God can awake to perception and discourse, annihilation is unthinkable. On this point Dionysius rejects the teaching of his "initiator," Hierotheos. The safe-guarding of personality is the first arrest which Christianity lays on the unrelieved mysticism of the ancients.

But from this arrest there ensues a schism in the personal life.

One question emerges from the bewilderment of words which perplexes the commentators of Dionysius. Is there any organ of intellectual apprehension which awakes only in the slumber of sense and reason? Pachymeres, the like-minded disciple of Dionysius, defines the mystical theology of his master in these terms: "Mystical theology is not perception or discourse, not a movement of the mind, not an operation, not a habit, nothing that any other power which we possess will bring to us; but if, in absolute immobility of mind, we are illumined concerning it, we shall know that it is beyond anything cognizable by the mind of man." It may at once be confessed that it is purely impossible to detect in any of its workings an organ whose operation evades all intellectual tests. But we may ask, Can the soul, returning from the depths of God, bring with it any elucidation of the mysteries which attach to finite being? Dionysius' doctrine of regress is a tacit confession that it cannot. The soul withdraws itself from that transcendent radiance, and the vision darkens. In the reawakening of sense and reason the

soul becomes disabled from the apprehension of pure being, and even memory refuses to retain that which eludes the comprehension of intellectual energies. Pure knowledge is therefore in no way to be distinguished from pure ignorance, and the "ineffable ray" which enlightens is—darkness.

Dionysius left to his successors the task of repairing the cleft which he had struck through the personal life.

The solution which was indicated by the Victorines, approved by the "columnar doctors" of the Church, and accepted by the English contemplationists is in brief:—

Building upon the foundation of Plotinus, the Church mystics taught that the soul has two "faces"; it looks God-ward and creature-ward. The two soul-relations meet in the "phantasy," the faculty which receives sense-impressions from the lower soul, and lifts them up into the region of spirit. By some mysterious energy of control, infused into the mind through grace,¹ perception and representation are transmuted into acts of the superior soul—acts of understanding, affection, will. These again are taken up into one "pure act" of adherence to God. A "pure act" is an "act without potentiality"; that is to say, an act in which the whole nature is engaged. That which unites to Deity, therefore, is not thought in its simplicity, nor mere affection, nor isolated volition, but all—understanding, love, and will (three flames within the one light)—gathering themselves into a burning point, and soaring upwards to God.

A question of the first importance in the mystical scheme concerns itself with the relation of the normal acts of the superior soul to that "pure act" which secures union with Deity. It is inevitable that reason, affection,

¹ The Church mystics are vague in their statement of this operation of grace.

and will should co-operate in this "blind impulse" of adherence. But how? The true answer lies in the consideration of our relation to God. He may be regarded as either Absolute Essence, the First Cause, or the Father of Mercies. The Syrian mystics reaching forth to the Absolute Essence sought to attain union by pure thought. The German mystics endeavoured by the annihilation of the will to merge themselves in the Creator and Preserver of all. The English contemplationists teach that, as in great heat smoke is turned to flame, so, in the uplifting of the mind, "love absorbs all the acts of the soul."¹

Our author, as befits a Catholic mystic, bars the road by which thought would rise: "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him." But he seems to lay the emphasis indifferently on love and will; and here, perhaps, his indebtedness to the school of Eckhart becomes most evident. Careful consideration will show, however, that he gives the pre-eminence to love; it is union with the Father of mercies which he seeks. In a word his scheme is, Understanding embraces the doctrines of the Faith, thereafter the will raises the affections towards God, and love enters into union.

To recapitulate: the teaching of this fourteenth century mystic is in substance:—

(a) The "mirk of ignorance" is in the first instance the entrance of the soul into itself; thereafter it is the entrance of the soul, within itself, into God.

(b) That region of the soul in which God dwells is removed in stillness beyond the intrusion of the perceptive or discursive faculties. But as the senses are the 'Levites

¹ This is the bridge which Grosseteste flings across the chasm in the personal life. See MSS. Line. Coll. Ox. 101; Cam. Kk. iv. 4; *Opera Dionysii* (Argent. 1503, 2), pp. 264-271.

who wait upon the energies of the superior soul, so these energies are as the attendant priests who minister to the hierarchic spirit to whom alone has been given the right of entrance through the veil into the holiest.

(c) When the spirit enters the unveiled presence of God, the tumultuous activity of the soul—feeling, longing, knowing—is hushed. The recognition of self and the distinctiveness of Deity die away; the soul adheres to God in pure passivity; amid silence, emptiness, darkness, He stands revealed, and the soul sinks in its nothingness into God. Thought and affection cease, understanding and emotion are merged in one subconscious impulse which falls into quiescence when the affective, thinking subject becomes identified with Him who transcends distinction. Thus the spirit unclothes itself of the “witting and feeling” of its own being, and is clothed upon with God. And as in the Tabernacle of Witness the uncreated glory filled the house in such wise that the white-robed ministrants “could not stand to minister because of the cloud,” but were driven out before it, so the interior presence of God compels the cessation of all activity of the natural powers, and the soul entering into perfection is made one with Him.

DAVID M. M'INTYRE.

THE RESTATEMENT OF THE GOSPEL FOR
TO-DAY.

I.

(1) THERE are three factors in modern thought which are generally regarded as making the restatement of the Christian Gospel an urgent task—criticism, science and philosophy. It may be conceded that criticism has so altered our view of the Bible, that science has so modified our conception of nature, and that philosophy has so affected our intellectual standpoint in relation both to nature and to man, and consequently to God also, that some adjustment of Christian doctrine to the new mental environment is absolutely necessary. (i.) Criticism has driven us from a false to a true view of the purpose and character of divine revelation; it has taught us that revelation is *personal* through the transformation of human lives, *practical* to foster goodness and godliness, *progressive*, advancing from lower to higher stages of thought and life until *perfected* in the truth and grace of Christ, throughout its course *redemption* in promise until in Christ it is *redemption* in fulfilment. It has taught us that the Scriptures are given of God to make men wise unto the salvation which is in Christ Jesus, not to give them knowledge of astronomy, geology, biology, or anthropology. It has relieved the Christian Church of the grievous task of reconciling Scripture and science by making it clear that with the process of creation, with the origin and development of man as included in that process, the divine revelation has no concern; but all inquiry and

discovery in this realm is left to human science. It has concentrated attention on that in the Bible which has spiritual significance and moral value, God's purpose of truth and grace fulfilled in Christ. It is not loss, but gain, that Christian theology can withdraw from the defence of the temporal and local knowledge of nature and man which is embodied in the Scriptures as human literature, even though inspired ; and can give itself to the advance of that permanent and universal divine truth and grace which is enshrined in the Scriptures because inspired human literature. No Christian theologian need dread criticism ; it may be welcomed not as a foe, but a friend to Christian faith. (ii.) This does not mean that critics are infallible, that every new critical theory is to set us to revising our creed in feverish haste. As a *method* criticism has so surely established itself that the new view of the Bible it leads us to cannot be rejected ; as regards its *results* it too knows something of fleeting fashions. It was a short time ago a common assumption among critics that in the earlier prophets there was only denunciation of judgment, and there was no announcement of mercy, and all passages relating to the Messianic hope must be treated as interpolations ; more recently it has been maintained that the eschatology of the prophets is a survival of a much older mythology. As regards the New Testament writings Harnack represents in Germany at least a conservative reaction ; he admits Luke's authorship of the Third Gospel, assigns the Second Gospel to Mark, reproduces the Logia or earliest report of Jesus' teaching and work as embodied with comparatively little change in the First Gospel. These instances teach us that we must not be always revising our creed to bring it into accord with the last book we have read, but may await with patience and confidence the assured results of the new movement.

(2) Science has made many discoveries which fuller knowledge is not likely to disprove ; it has also indulged in many hypotheses that are changing from day to day, (i.) Christian theology may be required to acknowledge, and there is no reason why it should hesitate to acknowledge, the exclusive authority of science in its own sphere, the observation, classification, and explanation of *phenomena*, not only physical, but even mental and moral, although in the latter self-consciousness compels the interpretation of them from a higher standpoint than that of science. With facts, laws, causes, science is concerned. It tells us what *is*, not what *can be*, or *ought to be* ; the *actual*, not the *possible* or the *ideal* is its sphere. It is necessary to insist on this ; as Christian theology has sometimes been required to yield, not to a legitimate demand, but to an unwarranted encroachment of science. Science can describe for us the ordinary processes of nature ; it cannot determine whether extraordinary occurrences are possible or not. It can tell us what are the common processes of human thinking, feeling, willing ; it cannot tell us whether divine inspiration may or may not stimulate and direct these activities. It can report the dictates of conscience and the sense of freedom as facts of consciousness ; it cannot prove the validity of the one, or the value of the other. This limitation of the sphere of science needs to be insisted on if intellectual confusion is to be avoided. (ii.) Science has banished a *supernaturalism* which set no value on the manifestation of the divine reason and character in law and order, a physical and a moral *cosmos*, a regular and harmonious universe, and looked for the evidences of the divine in the exceptional, however trivial and purposeless. That evolution is the method of divine working in nature and history, that grace even has its own law and order is a conclusion that modern science presses on the acceptance of Christian theology, and

Christian theology will interpret the works and ways of God to men more truly as it accepts this. Science may demand of Christian theology that no miracle shall be affirmed unless good reason can be shown why the ordinary processes of nature or of mind were departed from. Science is within its rights when it insists on careful scrutiny of whatever presents itself in the Scriptures as supernatural. (iii.) It exceeds its authority, however, when it affirms that miracles are *impossible*, or even *improbable*. It can tell us only that God habitually works thus and thus, it cannot declare that God cannot work otherwise in an original fashion. The rejection of the supernatural as impossible is not a demand that science may lawfully make; and, therefore, the restatement of the Gospel, which recognizes the truth of science, need not exclude miracles. Science cannot sound the abysmal depths of man's need of redemption; it cannot scale the empyrean heights of God's grace in redeeming; it cannot therefore pronounce any judgment even on the *probability* of miracles. There is no justification for the assumption that to be *scientific* in our thinking it is necessary for us to distrust, doubt, or deny the supernatural and the miraculous. God's grace unto salvation does not belong to the realm that science can observe, classify, and explain. We must see to it that we do not mutilate the Gospel in order to lay it as a vain sacrifice on the altar of science.

(3) Into philosophy, which is the attempt to interpret the world as a whole, not to explain it in its parts, as is the function of science, the personal equation inevitably enters more largely. It is a speculative construction of the *data* collected by experience. (i.) It comes into contact with Christian theology at more points than science or criticism. If a speculative system declares the ultimate problem of existence insoluble, or solves it by some other conception

than that of a personal God, it comes into inevitable conflict with the Christian Gospel. No speculative system, however, has or can have the certainty of the religious experience of the grace of God in Christ, and accordingly Christian theology does not need to wait on any philosophy for the terms of its restatement of the Christian Gospel. Nevertheless, not a few Christian teachers have allowed themselves to be unduly influenced by current philosophical ideas without testing their validity by the moral conscience or the religious consciousness. (ii.) The absolute idealism of Hegel, for instance, has been considered by many as offering the only appropriate intellectual forms for the expression and explanation of the Christian faith, even though that system appears to exclude the personality of God and the reality of sin. That idealism has rendered service to Christian thought in proving the inadequacy of any agnostic or materialistic solution of the problem of existence may be fully conceded; that its exposition of a reason in, through, and over all may be subordinated to a Christian view of the world may as fully be acknowledged; that its ambition to think things together may be a stimulus to constructive theological thought, the writer can from personal experience testify. But, as it does not do full justice to the testimony either of morality or of religion, it cannot claim to dictate to Christian theology how the Gospel shall be presented to-day. A theologian is neither obscurantist nor reactionary who refuses to cut and carve the Christian oracles into the shapes presented by this attractive, but also deceptive speculation. (iii.) It is worthy of note that at the very time when some Christian teachers would enthrone Hegel in Christian theology, the claims of his philosophy are being most vigorously and effectively denied by philosophical thinkers. In England there is the school of personal idealism, which seeks to escape the abstract intellectualism of *Hegel's* view; in the

more extreme form of pragmatism all thought is regarded as dominated by practical needs. In Germany *Lotze* vindicated the conception of personality in application alike to God and man in distinct opposition to the one-sided insistence on reason as constituting reality in Hegel's system. The latest phase of German philosophical thought is the activism of *Eucken*, which maintains that it is by achieving in himself the spiritual life that a man wins the standpoint for the true philosophy. This system has much closer kinship with Christian faith than Hegelianism. It is not intended to depreciate philosophy, but only to make clear that no system is final ; and that therefore no system offers so assured a standpoint for thought that Christian theology is under obligation to satisfy all its demands in the restatement of the Gospel.

(4) Criticism, science, and philosophy are complex movements, and require to be studied with discrimination. Not every new conclusion is a permanent contribution of thought, and Christian theology has not only a right but also a duty to prove all things, and hold fast only that which is good. (i.) Some who are most eager about making the statement of the Gospel up to date to-day show a glaring inconsistency in their treatment of the theology of former days. That the Fourth Evangelist used Philonic metaphysics, and the Apostle to the Gentiles Rabbinic exegesis, are facts insisted on to invalidate their authority ; that the ecumenical creeds show the influence of Greek philosophy and of Roman jurisprudence is emphasized to diminish their value. Are not these all instances of adapting the Christian faith to its intellectual environment ? What is asserted as the duty of the theologian to-day is the offence of the theologians of former days. What we have to ask that we may judge righteously is : was the essential Christian experience mutilated, or was it preserved in the theological expression

and explanation given to it in any age ? That the creeds did in some degree obscure the truth and grace of Jesus Christ is by most modern theologians conceded. But does the Philonic metaphysics hide from us in the Fourth Gospel the glory of the only-begotten of the Father, and does the Rabbinic exegesis take from us the assurance of the perfect salvation which Paul found in Jesus Christ ? The test of every theological restatement of the Gospel is this : does it or does it not accord with Christian experience ? (iii.) Accordingly, it is necessary to insist on the old principle that the heart makes the theologian ; it is a comprehensive and intense Christian experience which alone qualifies a man to attempt with any safety or promise of success the restatement of the Gospel. He must live what he thinks and teaches. One cannot but feel that a good deal of theologizing to-day, especially by young men, lacks this indispensable quality. There are a great many men who have, as it were, inherited the Christian *ethos*, without having passed through the Christian experience. They have learned to know, trust, love and serve Jesus as Teacher, Example, Friend, Master ; but they have never had the Son revealed in them as the Saviour, and the only Saviour. Because they have never said with Paul, " O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me out of the body of this death ? " they cannot say with him, " But far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world has been crucified unto me, and I unto the world." The Cross, as it is interpreted by evangelicalism, is an offence and foolishness to them, not the power and the wisdom of God, because they have not felt its healing virtue from the plague of sin. The writer would venture to suggest that we must become very much more Christian ourselves before we can express and explain in new forms the Gospel. Criticism, science, philosophy, we must know all these, and be

ready to learn whatever each may teach us, but what we need to know above all is that in Christ we have passed out of darkness into God's marvellous light.

II.

(1) Besides these three intellectual conditions—criticism, science, and philosophy, there are two practical demands for a restatement of the Gospel. The Foreign Mission and the Social Reform enterprises of the Christian Church are by some persons regarded as an urgent reason for theological change. It is said that we must not take our theology, based on our philosophy, to India and China with their ancient civilizations and cultures, whatever we may do in regard to the savages of Africa and the Pacific Islands. That our temporary and local opinions and customs should not be thus imposed on other peoples, no one can doubt for a single moment. But it is a very serious question how far we are bound to modify the statement of the Gospel so as to adapt it to the new environment into which it is to be carried. Is the offence of the Cross due to the Cross itself, or to our Occidental methods of presenting it to Oriental minds? There are a few misconceptions which must be removed before we can face the question. *First of all*, let it be remembered that the Gospel is not a native product of European thought and life; but came to our forefathers from another race—the Semitic, distinguished by many characteristic features from the Aryan, to which not only Europeans but even the Hindus belong. *Secondly*, let it be remembered that the forms of thought and modes of life that appear at first sight to be most thoroughly our own are found, when traced to their roots, to be due to the Gospel itself. *Thirdly*, the term Oriental is so vague a term that its use in this connexion can only confuse. The characteristics of the Chinaman and Hindu, although both can be

described as Orientals, are very far from being the same ; racially, they are farther apart than the Hindu and the Englishman. They have not that in common in distinction from the European which would enable them to understand Christ better than the European can. *Fourthly*, even if as regards external custom and costume the Hindu or the Chinaman might have the advantage of greater familiarity with the conditions of Jesus' earthly life than the Englishman, yet for the understanding of the Gospel that counts for nothing. For, *fifthly*, what has been rightly emphasized as the characteristic of Jesus is His *universality* in thought and life ; what is distinctive and essential to His Gospel is no more Oriental than Occidental. *Lastly*, the Gospel has modified European thought and life, correcting defects and imparting excellences ; and it claims no less to transform the thought and the life of China and of India. The writer's conviction is that, if the Gospel were to be adapted to Indian or Chinese thought and life as some writers to-day maintain it should, it would become as a salt that had lost its savour. There are some distinctive elements in the Gospel which we must maintain whether they offend the Chinese or Indian mind or not, because they belong necessarily to it as the power and wisdom of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, whether European or Asiatic. We may better understand our own Gospel, if we now endeavour to observe the features we must insist on in our Foreign Missions. To the writer there seem to be at least three : the personality of God, the reality of sin, and the necessity of atonement.

(2) The ethical monotheism which is the basis of the Christian Gospel is the result of a long and often painful religious and moral discipline of the Hebrew nation. (i.) It has been said that the Semitic conception of the divine is *theocratic*, while the Aryan is *anthropomorphic* ; the Semite emphasizes the supremacy of the divine, its distinction from the human,

as the Aryan does not. While a natural tendency towards monotheism cannot be assumed in the Semitic race, and still less, even if it existed, could it be regarded as an adequate explanation of the ethical monotheism, yet it is significant that the people to whom so unique a religious and moral history was divinely appointed belonged to a race that emphasized the difference between God and man. The divine revelation that was progressively given to this people did not obliterate, but emphasized, this distinction not merely as between Creator and creature, Sovereign and subject, but above all Holy God and sinful man. The national discipline which was the historical condition of this divine revelation presents to us a far-reaching divine providence. The empires of the Ancient World are in turn used as instruments in God's hand for the fulfilment of His purpose with His people. This ethical monotheism in which the personality of God is emphasized, appears not as the religious peculiarity of this one people, but as the intended result of a progressive revelation. The Christian Church inherited it, and opposed it to the corrupt polytheisms of Greece and Rome. If any fault is to be found, it is that in contact with paganism the Church did not maintain this ethical monotheism with adequate rigour and vigour, and allowed polytheism to steal in again in the form of saint and angel worship. (ii.) For the unity of the Godhead it is not necessary now to contend; polytheism is once for all discredited for human thought. But the personality of the one God needs still to be maintained. The popular polytheism of India is accompanied by a speculative pantheism; and it is sometimes urged that from this Christian theology has much to learn, and that in India at least the Gospel might be transferred from its monotheistic to this pantheistic basis. In making this contention the following consideration should be insisted on. *First of all*, pantheism is tolerant of poly-

theism ; if all is God, and God is all, plant, tree, stone, bird, beast, as divine, may be so worshipped. If the speculative pantheism is compromised with, the popular polytheism will not be conquered. *Secondly*, this polytheism meets a religious need that the pantheism does not, even the need of personality in the object of worship. Man craves mind, heart, will, responsive to his appeal, in God. The polytheism that meets this need can be got rid of only as the one God in, over, through all, is recognized as personal. *Thirdly*, this speculative pantheism obliterates moral distinctions ; if God alone is, and everything is God, vice is as divine as virtue, sin has no meaning, and goodness no worth. Those familiar with Hindu life have testified that this is no theoretical objection, but a practical difficulty. It is difficult to convict the Hindu conscience of guilt. *Fourthly*, this speculative pantheism fosters a type of piety which must be condemned. By meditation to reach the consciousness *tat twam asi*, that art thou, the absorption of the human in the divine, this is Hindu saintship. Can that inspire a progressive Christian culture or civilization ? Is it not the negation of thought, work, life itself ? India, to give it spiritual vitality and moral vigour, needs the ethical monotheism.

(3) This ethical monotheism, which affirmed the perfect personality of God, also deepened in men the sense of their sinfulness. The reality of sin is not a distinctive doctrine of the Christian Gospel ; it is presupposed rather than announced. But it is the intention of the Christian Gospel to make men more conscious of their weakness and unworthiness that they may more fully realize their need of the salvation offered. (i.) Confucius was a moralist who laid down great and worthy moral principles. If he gave the Golden Rule in a negative form, his illustrations of it show that he did not apply it only negatively. If he fell short of

Lao-tse's teaching not to return evil for evil, but good for evil, he at least forbade vengeance and insisted only on justice in return for evil. But he regarded man as by nature good, and his disciple, Mencius, still more emphasized this view; he believed that good government could bring about moral reform; he confused manners and morals, attaching to propriety of conduct an undue importance; and he put an arrest on moral progress. The influence of Confucius on China has been to make it exclusive, conceited, self-satisfied. The popular religion makes good fortune depend so much on the Hung-Schui, the Wind and Weather, that is, physical conditions, that the relation of character to circumstances is obscured. What China does need is moral quickening, the presentation of a moral ideal in the person of Jesus Christ which will bring home to it how narrow and low are its Confucian precepts. If China is to enter into the comity of the cultured and civilized nations, the commonplace morality that has marked it in its isolation will need to give place to something more exacting, and therefore more humbling to its pride. (ii.) In regard to India this is still more necessary. Religion there consecrates many moral abominations, lust, and cruelty. Its pantheism, as has already been observed, blunts its moral sensibility. Before it can be made morally better, it must be made to feel how morally bad it is. To suppose, as some seem to do, that the sense of sinfulness in Christian saintship is morbid, that the Hindu's moral indifference is something to be commended rather than rebuked, is surely to commit one of the gravest possible errors. History has shown conclusively that repentance is the first step towards reform, that there can be moral progress even in outward habits only as there is a growing moral sensitiveness as regards even the moral dispositions. If India is to take the place it may take among the nations of the earth, its conscience must be made more

acute and exacting ; it must be made to drink the bitter cup of penitence. (iii.) To narrow down sin to selfishness, to wrongs done to, or kindnesses withheld from, others, is to lower morality. A Gospel of social duty only is not the Gospel to be taken to the dark places of the earth. Men need to be convicted of sin in their relation to God, their indifference to, distrust of, and estrangement from, God must be brought home to their consciences as sin. The absolute demand of God's holy love, as Jesus Himself realized it, and as He imposes it on men, must be presented as well as the social obligations of one man to another. This conviction of the reality of sin may in many cases be wrought most effectively by the better life of the Christian missionary reflecting, however feebly, the moral glory of Christ, awaking new moral aspirations, and therefore showing men clearly the old moral failures. The Gospel must convict of sin that it may convert to God.

(4) If, on the one hand, the Gospel presents the holy God, and on the other the sinful man, it will reinforce, it does not need for the first time to evoke, the consciousness of the necessity of atonement. (i.) A common feature of the religions of the world is sacrifice ; if it cannot be affirmed confidently that in every religion sacrifice is thought of as atoning for sin, yet there are abounding instances of this conception of sacrifice. Cruel and corrupt as are many of the modes of sacrifice, superstitious as are many of the ideas connected with it, this feature of religion is too wide-spread and deep-rooted to be disregarded. Although ritual has been a substitute for righteousness and men have often thought that they could compound for their sins by their offerings, yet sacrifice does reveal a human necessity which has not found any permanent and adequate satisfaction apart from the Cross of Christ. For, as soon as conscience is developed, the insufficiency of the sacrifices is realized ; a broken and a

contrite heart, or an obedient will comes to be regarded as more acceptable unto God, and yet men feel how difficult it is for them to bring this offering. (ii.) While in presenting the Gospel the utmost care must be exercised in correcting the false and wrong views that generally attach to the institution of sacrifice, while, above all, the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ must replace the greedy and the cruel gods, to whom sacrifice is usually offered, yet the promise of better things that is in the rite should not be disregarded; and a point of contact for the doctrine of the Cross can here be found. What man in his sacrifices has vainly tried to do, that God in His sacrifice has freely done, has presented Himself as propitious, and has reconciled men to Himself. To lay emphasis on the cost of this salvation, the sorrow, shame, and suffering of God's only-begotten and well-beloved Son, will quicken conscience with a sense of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, as well as assure the heart of the greatness of the love of God. Probably those in whose religious life sacrifice has had a place constantly will not find the same difficulty in apprehending the necessity of atonement as some Christian thinkers to-day feel; and if, as the history of the Christian Church shows, the religious revivals have followed a lifting-up of Christ Crucified, it may be argued that in heathen lands too it is the Cross which will prove the power and the wisdom of God unto salvation. Difficulties that thoughtful and serious men to-day feel about the doctrine of the atonement should not be allowed to stand in the way of the Cross showing its saving efficacy in the foreign mission enterprise. Harnack has pointed out that animal sacrifices have ceased as the Gospel of the Cross has been preached and believed, and we may confidently expect the same results in future days. (iii.) It is not in any unsympathetic attitude towards the other religions of the world that it is here urged that in our foreign missions the

distinctive features of the Christian Gospel should be thus constantly and confidently maintained, but because it is certain for Christian faith that while God has never and nowhere left himself without witness, yet He has entrusted to the Church a revelation of His truth and grace in His dear Son which is as the sunlight to the moonlight of all other faiths ; He has treated humanity as one body, entrusting to its several members different functions, but each for the good of the whole body, and to the Christian peoples the function to make known the unsearchable riches of Christ to all mankind.

III.

(1) Jesus likened the Kingdom of God to the leaven as well as to the mustard seed ; He recognized its pervasive as well as expansive quality. We have been considering the restatement of the Gospel in its relation to the foreign missionary enterprise ; we must now turn to its leavening power in our society at home. (i.) One of the urgent calls on the Church to-day is for social reform. We are learning that human liberty is limited by heredity and environment ; that, therefore, moral character and religious disposition are affected by the inheritance society brings to, and the influence it wields on, the individual ; that the condition of society for weal or woe, for good or evil is determined by many factors, but one of the most potent is the economic organization. What may be without any exaggeration described as an industrial revolution took place at the beginning of last century, and society has not yet adjusted itself to this far-reaching change. Socially we are in the death-throe of an old, and the birth-pang of a new order. What is needed more than anything else is this, that the Spirit of God in the instruction and influence of the Christian Church should brood over the chaos, so that it may pass

into a cosmos. The Christian Church is now beginning to realize its social mission as well as individual message. The conception of the Kingdom of God is securing a recognition in Christian theology that it has never had before; the nature of the Christian salvation is being defined not so much in relation to individual gain as social good. It would seem that the Divine Providence in external history and in inward movements of the Spirit of God is presenting the opportunity and enforcing the obligation.

(ii.) The writer's personal experience of Christian work in the slums and mean streets of a great city has rooted deeply the conviction that this urgent call should find a more ready and hearty response than it has as yet received from our churches. There is not only what Dr. Paton, one of the noblest and most honoured leaders in the movement, has called the *social redemptive mission of the Church*—the relief of the misery, the comfort of the sorrow, the help of the need which our present social condition involves from the motive, by the method, and in the manner of the Cross of Jesus. There is also the holding of the keys of the kingdom by the Church, the binding and the loosing; that is the declaration of what is right and what is wrong in our social relations and our industrial organization. The Church is, as Dr. Forsyth has argued, the Moral Guide of Society. The Church is in the world not only for *mercy*, as exercised in this *social redemptive mission*, but also for *judgment*, in the exposition and enforcement of the Christian ideal in relation to the sad and hard and evil conditions around us.

(iii.) It is felt by very many that if this call is to be obeyed, there must be a modification in our theological statements. If the Church is to be made to recognize its social obligations, it seems necessary to many that the conception both of divine grace and human faith should be so modified as to make clear that grace is the inspiration and faith is the recognition of a

ministry of succour, comfort, help to others. As the evangelical interpretation of the Cross of Christ contains all that is needful to enforce this social obligation, we need not look elsewhere for power and guidance in this task. Let us consider the elements in the Christian Gospel which in this connexion need to be emphasized.

(2) The Cross of Christ, if we first of all fix our regard on the spirit and the purpose of the Crucified, is the supreme instance in human history of the sacrifice of self. (i.) The mind that was in Christ was this : though He was in the form of God, yet He did not regard it as a prize to be snatched, or to be held fast, to be on an equality with God, but He emptied Himself, and humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross. This was the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor. As Gethsemane and Calvary show, He was willing to surrender what was the highest good, the joy of His Father's presence. More even He, the Son of God, could not offer ; His was love unto self-sacrifice to the uttermost. (ii.) This perfection of the character of Jesus has sometimes found clearer recognition and closer imitation in those who have been estranged doctrinally from evangelicalism ; and it is to be confessed with shame and sadness that many who gloried in the Cross as the means of their individual salvation have not gloried in the Cross as the power that crucified them to the world, and the world unto them. Faith is the apprehension, the appreciation, and the appropriation of the grace of Christ. It can, therefore, receive and respond to the sacrifice of Christ only in such a surrender to Him as will enforce and enable any sacrifice for others that His will to save others may require. The salvation that is by sacrifice is necessarily unto sacrifice. He for whom Christ is crucified must also be crucified with Christ. It is surely time that we stopped cheapening sal-

vation and so vulgarizing the Gospel of the grace of God, if with a popular revivalism we have been overdoing it before. Only he who has the spirit of Christ is Christ's; only he is saved, who is delivered from selfishness, who by grace has ceased to care for his individual gain, and seeks only the common good. When Paul declared that he was willing to be *anathema* from Christ for his brethren's sake, his kinsmen according to the flesh, the wish itself made the fulfilment impossible; the willingness to surrender, if need be, for the sake of others the Christian salvation made him most thoroughly secure. (iii.) This spirit is not a luxury to be enjoyed by the few elect saints; it is an obligation which rests on all. No man has a right to claim that he is saved unless he is growing daily in the life of the Cross. That does not mean any arbitrary or artificial asceticisms; the sad countenance and the disfigured face, that they may be seen of men to fast, is the ostentation of the Pharisee which Christ condemns. But it does mean a willingness to give up any worldly goods or selfish gains which hinder the whole-hearted and single-minded surrender of self to the cause of Christ, the Kingdom of God on earth. Why do so many sympathetic yet discerning observers declare that we are not ripe for socialism? Because the spirit that so aggravates the evils of the competitive phase of our industrial organization, the spirit of greed and pleasure and pride—in a word, of selfishness—has not been exorcised, and there is not enough unselfishness to make even a restricted experiment of collectivism practical. Whether socialism be the remedy for our social disorder or not, this is certain, that no better order than the present can be reached until the Church of Christ be baptized with the Eternal Spirit in which Christ offered Himself on the Cross.

(3) Let us look a little more closely still at the spirit of the Cross. Wherein lay for Christ the *sacrifice of self*? We can

answer in one phrase, *substitution for others*. (i.) He became poor, though Himself rich, that the poor might be made rich. He who knew no sin was made sin that the sinful might be made the righteousness of God in Him. He became a curse that He might redeem men from the curse. In a word, He exchanged with men. He took our lot ; He gave us His life. This truth of substitution has often been so misrepresented, that it seems needful to define very carefully what we mean by it. It means no legal fiction, but a real experience. It does not mean that Jesus was regarded by God, or regarded Himself, as guilty ; it does not mean that the wrath of God as a personal feeling rested upon Him, or that He ever felt that God was angry with Him ; it does not mean that He was punished, and knew Himself to be punished instead of man. The sinless and beloved Son of God could not, and did not, experience any of these things. It is inexcusable and intolerable that evangelicalism should be so caricatured, and that the crudities of the street-corner preacher should be attributed to the trained theologian. This substitution for others does not mean only that Jesus endured the outward pains and woes which living in a sinful world involved, that He submitted to death as the event that cometh to all. This substitution for others involved such an identification of Himself with others that He experienced as His very own the struggle, the sorrow, the shame, the darkness, the desolation, the despair with which sin invests both life and death ; and His experience was so much more intense as He in moral conscience and religious consciousness transcended man. (ii.) The sacrifice of self to which Christians are called in this work of social reform involves for them also *substitution for others*. This problem will not be solved by our gifts unless we also give ourselves. The West End cannot by its subscriptions to societies, by its philanthropy by proxy, save the East End. Nothing so hinders the redemp-

tion of society as the separation of classes, the distance between those who need help, and those who can help. It is only at close quarters that these evils can be gripped and grappled with. Reading will not give the clear and full knowledge that living among the poor and the outcast does. The heart cannot be so touched and moved by the printed page as by the living epistles of sorrow and shame when we read them for ourselves by personal contact. Accordingly the will cannot be stimulated to energy in succour and service unless the need and the peril of the brother man make their direct appeal. An American humorist has said that the Golden Rule means, Be the other fellow. How much charity is stupid, cruel, and hurtful because the giver has not through love lived himself into oneness of feeling and wish with the recipient. University settlements are a practical application of this principle of substitution for others. But how numerous and manifold must the applications of the principle be before it makes itself felt to be a potent factor in the salvation of society ! The strong must bear the burdens of the weak, but not at a distance, nor yet on the helpful hand only, but also and above all on the tender heart. We may surely commend and confirm this necessary method of doing good by making clear to men that it is an essential element in the sacrifice, through which comes their salvation.

(4) But we must press our question further. Why was the *sacrifice of self in substitution for others* necessary in the Cross of Christ ? The unhesitating answer must be, because both the outward testimony of the Scriptures and the inward witness of conscience alike demand it. It was for the *satisfaction of righteousness*. (i.) It was not an angry God, who had to be appeased ; *modern evangelicalism* holds no such opinion. It was not even moral law that had to be vindicated or a moral order that had to be maintained, although

these views have been more recently advocated, and have in them truth, though abstractly. It was a Holy Father who, in restoring sinful mankind to Himself though His forgiveness, made plain beyond doubt, or denial, or question, His judgment of the sins He forgave. The *sacrifice of self* in Jesus culminated, the *substitution of Himself for others* was completed, in the tasting death for every man, *for the satisfaction of righteousness* in His submission to the moral order which conjoins sin and death, not as physical dissolution merely, but as separation from the light, the life and the love of God. The Son here in obeying revealed the Father ; He approved by endorsing this divine condemnation of sin. This truth cannot be proved by a logical demonstration ; Jesus learned the necessity of His death as a moral intuition. It was upon His knees in prayer He said, " If this cup may not pass from me, Thy will be done." Our consciences must respond to this moral intuition of Jesus, and our forgiveness will mean so much more to us, because we know that in the Cross there is *satisfaction of righteousness*. Not only is the moral order maintained, but the holy love of God in Christ judges the sin it forgives. It satisfies conscience, that this holy love of God is on the Cross satisfied. (ii.) Can this aspect of the Cross be transferred to the task of social reform ? It is certain that the better order will not come unless this is fully recognized. We condemn the existing social order, not merely because it causes misery, but because it contradicts justice ; we advocate reform not in the name of pity only, but of righteousness. To make our protest and our plea more effective we must appeal to conscience as well as to compassion. Sweating is bad for the sweater as well as the sweated ; we want to save the sweater from the wrong he does, as the sweated from the wrong they suffer. We want to rescue Dives from his future torments as well as Lazarus from his present afflictions. From the standpoint

of Jesus worse is the condition of the oppressor than of the oppressed, of the defrauding rich than of the defrauded poor ; for sin is worse than sorrow, and wrong than misery. Should we not be as desirous of making society just as of showing it kind ? It is this that those who know and feel the evils of our present state desire. "Curse your charity, we want justice," may be a very rude expression of a very bad mood. But we have much to learn from it. A just state will be a kind state ; and righteousness will not err in its compassion. (iii.) Not only in society as a whole, but in the individuals we seek to help, we ought to aim at the satisfaction of righteousness. We are to put ourselves in the position of others, so as to realize their miseries and wrongs, but we are not bound to look on these as they look on these, or give them just the relief they may want. We are to do for them what will be for their highest good ; we must always seek to improve their character as well as relieve their necessities, and we must therefore relieve their necessities in such a way as will not injure their character. We give ourselves in putting ourselves in the place of others that they may give themselves to God. Social Reform needs for its motive, method, and purpose the Cross.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

NOTES ON CHRISTIAN HISTORY IN ASIA MINOR.

I. THE PERSECUTIONS OF PAUL IN ICONIUM AND IN
PISIDIAN ANTIOCH.

THE character and spirit of those two cities differed as much as their constitutions. Iconium was a Hellenic city, inheriting almost unchanged the traditions of Hellenistic time. It was, indeed, strongly Roman in feeling, and enthusiastically loyal to the Empire. It fully deserved the name "Claudian Iconium," which was bestowed on it

between 41 and 54 A.D. The bestowal and acceptance of such a title is not a mere empty name ; it implies much with regard to the feeling of the city. To understand how much it meant, one has only to think how impossible it is that the name "Victorian Dublin" should have been either offered or accepted in modern time, and how utterly different Irish feeling and Irish history in the nineteenth century would have been, if such a title had been a political possibility.

Pisidian Antioch was a Roman Colonia. In it was a ruling aristocracy or oligarchy of Romans, descended from veteran soldiers of Augustus, who were settled there soon after 25 B.C. The older Hellenistic population was only a half-privileged class, ranking as residents (*incolæ*) but not as burghers of the Colonia.

Thus in the one city there was a small ruling class, acting through their own elected Roman magistrates, in the other the power lay in the hands of the whole body of free citizens, and the rulers were elected by the votes of all citizens and were responsible to them.

At Pisidian Antioch the disaffected Jews proceeded against Paul and Barnabas by secret intrigue. Luke states clearly that the Jews appealed by private machinations to a small ruling caste, "the 'God-fearing' women of honourable estate, and the chief men of the city." They worked on the feelings of the oligarchy, approaching them through the women of that class, and thus roused an official persecution, which culminated in action of the magistrates. The apostles were seized, in all probability flogged by the lictors,¹ and turned out of the Colony. In this view we see that there disappears all the apparent incon-

¹ This is not mentioned by Luke ; but it might be presupposed as self-evident by any one who thinks of the nature of Roman official action, and it is clearly alluded to by Paul in 2 Corinthians xi. 25. Such a kind of flogging could be inflicted only by Roman magistrates in Coloniae like Philippi, Lystra, and Antioch.

sistency between the enthusiastic reception which Paul and Barnabas received from the Gentile population of the city with the whole region to which it belonged, and his harsh treatment by the rulers. The population in general was Greek-speaking, and was addressed by Paul in that tongue. The aristocracy and the rulers were Roman, and Latin-speaking (as the inscriptions show). The Roman privileged class, therefore, remained unaffected by the new teaching : an aristocracy is generally the last section of the population to be affected by a missionary movement.

In Iconium the facts are utterly different in character. There is not a word implying an oligarchy. The Jewish appeal here has to be made to the mass of the population, and it had to be made much more slowly, for the Jews were never popular with the mob of Hellenic cities. Time and delicate misrepresentation were necessary. Luke's account brings out very clearly the character of the situation and the facts. In his narrative, brief as it is and quite general in its terms, we at first get the impression only of a period of successful work, followed by a riot and expulsion from the city. But more careful study shows several stages and a kind of action different altogether from what happened at Antioch. The Apostles resided in all a considerable time at Iconium ; the emphasis laid on this shows that they stayed much longer there than in Antioch.¹

After a certain period, apparently quite short (as at Antioch), the Jews began to understand the intention and inevitable issue of Paul's work, some of them sided with, some against, the apostles (this also was the case, evidently, at Antioch, though the favourable section of the Jews was less numerous there). "The disbelieving Jews stirred up the souls of the Gentiles and made them evil affected." This was necessarily a slow process ; and while it was going

¹ This point was not sufficiently observed by me in *St. Paul the Traveller*.

on Paul and Barnabas "tarried there a long time, speaking boldly." Gradually "the population of the city was divided, and part held with the Jews and part with the apostles." There can be little doubt that the uneducated mob was the part that held with the Jews; that is shown both by the example of Lystra and by the issue in Iconium, for the attempt at stoning certainly proceeded from the lower class of citizens.

One must observe the art with which this narrative, short and general as it is, brings out the slow growth of the popular movement. The Jews begin to engineer it; then there follows a long period of bold and effective work by Paul and Barnabas; then at last a riot breaks out. The editor to whom we owe the Bezan text misunderstood the narrative, and was annoyed by the seeming inconsequence of the first apparently ineffective action of the Jews. Accordingly he introduces into the text a first riot originating from the Jewish action, but this riot was pacified, for "the Lord quickly gave peace." Thereafter he describes (as in the true text) the long period of work, and a second riot following on it and culminating in the expulsion of the apostles after an unsuccessful attempt to stone them.

II. THE CHRISTIAN CULTS OF ICONIUM.

Iconium, with its neighbourhood, is the one place in Asia Minor where the pre-Turkish ecclesiastical system remains in force to the present day with little change. The Christian population has remained in continuous possession of its own shrines, free to practise its own religious ceremonial with little restriction. In the Seljuk realm there was no tendency to oppress or ill-treat the Christian population, on which the industry and trade of the Mohammedan state largely depended. A Greek built the most beautiful college (Medresse) in Sivas, a leading city of the Seljuk empire, and his name

Kaloyan (i.e., Kalo-Yanni or Joannes) is inscribed upon it. The Christian heretics, who abounded in Phrygia and Lycaonia, preferred the mild Seljuk rule to the persecuting bigotry of the Orthodox Emperors. Hence the ritual of Iconium was not actively interfered with by the Moslems, while Konia lay too far apart from the Christian world to have its old customs modified by change of religious feelings or by the growth of new needs. In such a city as Smyrna, the existing facts of religion cannot safely be taken as evidence of the Byzantine system; for there foreign influence and close relation with other centres of Greek ecclesiastical authority have caused a certain amount of change (it cannot well be called development) in the Church. In Konia we can confidently regard the present facts as a true indication of Byzantine system. Hence a sketch, even imperfect, of the chief Greek ceremonial at Konia presents some interest as a record of historical survival.

There are four popular festivals (*panegyris*) among the Orthodox of Konia.

1. St. Chariton has a monastery, now uninhabited, except at the time of the festival on 28th September. The buildings, however, are kept in repair by a custodian (who is not a monk, but a layman). They are situated in a narrow rocky glen, which extends up from the plain of Konia into the mountains, about five miles north-west of the city, and close under the hill of St. Philip (Takali Dagh). This glen is parallel to the one in which is situated the large village of Sille, inhabited by many Christians and a smaller number of Mohammedans; but the glen of Sille is nearly a mile further north. The monastery of St. Chariton, situated under a perpendicular precipice on the north side of the glen, is regarded as holy even by the Moslems; a small mosque stands in the centre of it; and the Tchelebi Effendi, the chief of the Mevlevi order of Dervishes, makes a donation of olive-

oil every year. The legend explaining the origin of the Turkish veneration is mentioned in *Pauline and Other Studies*, p. 188; but according to the best form of the legend it was the son of a former Tehelebi Effendi, or of the founder of the Order, Djelal-ed-Din himself, who fell over the precipice and was caught in his fall by the Saint and so preserved.

St. Chariton was a real personage, but the biographical details which are preserved about him (*Acta Sanctorum*, 28th September, p. 475) are wholly legendary. The only facts that can be trusted are that he was born at Iconium and that he founded a famous monastery near Jerusalem. His date is stated under Aurelian (about 272 A.D.) by most authorities, which is impossible, under Julian (363-5 A.D.) by one, which may be correct.

Besides the Turkish mosque there are in the monastery shrines of the Virgin, of St. Saba, and of St. Amphilochius. The last was much venerated in Iconium itself (see below). St. Saba also was a founder of monasteries in Palestine; and therefore he was suitably associated with St. Chariton in this monastery.

2. St. Philip has given his name to the nearer of the twin peaks, which tower above Iconium about six or seven miles to the north-west. In photographs of the city their height is dwarfed, because the view is taken too close to the city. From a distance of ten or twenty miles, St. Philip seems to stand over Konia like a guardian. The broad and lofty summit of Loras Dagh above Kizil-Euren (Siniandos) is in some respects an even more striking feature of the scenery; but about the religious ideas which were doubtless connected with it I have learned nothing.

The hill of St. Philip had, beyond all question, religious meaning and awe for the Iconians of pre-Christian times; but about this nothing is known. The great Byzantine

fortress, which crowns the mountain, has obliterated all signs of pagan work. The Turkish name, Takali Dagħ, is evidently identical with Dakalias, as the Arabs of the ninth century called a great fortress near Iconium.¹ In July 1907, I heard from one informant that the name Gevele is also applied to Takali, but had not the opportunity of verifying this report. Gevele is the modern form of the ancient name Kabala or Kaballa.²

The *panegyris* at the hill of St. Philip is in my notes dated 24th November ; but this must be due to a slip on the part either of my informant (who made several other small inaccuracies, which he afterwards himself corrected) or of myself. The day of St. Philip the Apostle is 14th November in the Eastern Church, 1st May in the Western.

That St. Philip of Iconium was the Apostle, not the Deacon (whose festival was on 6th June), seems certain. It is possible that tradition told of the journey of St. Philip to Hierapolis and to Ephesus by way of Iconium ; and there is in fact a probability that a missionary would prefer the land-route to the sea-way, and the longer road through the Christian cities to the short "Syrian Route" from the Cilician Gates by Savatra. Why St. Philip should be preferred to St. Paul as the guardian of Iconium is a matter of local superstition, which is always capricious and irrational. Possibly Loras Dagħ, which overhangs St. Paul's road for many miles, was connected with the great Apostle of Iconium. I could not learn that any other cult of St. Philip exists in this neighbourhood except on the hill, where he is certainly only the successor of a pagan god.

3. St. Eustathius has a small church on the western outskirts of Konia : it is of late mediaeval or early modern

¹ See *Lycaonia* in the Austrian *Jahreshefte (Beiblatt)*, 1904, p. 121, where I conjectured that the fortress Dakalias guarded this road, but did not observe the identity with Takali ; also *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 359.

² See *Lycaonia*, p. 69.

time and possesses little architectural interest, except that it is the restored form of a much older church. How the worship of St. Eustathius became connected with Iconium, it is impossible to tell. According to the legendary biography, which is quite untrustworthy, Eustathius was the Christian name given at baptism to an official at Rome under Trajan. He was converted through the appearance of Christ to him when he was hunting; and his wife and two sons followed his example. In order to avoid participation in the celebration of Trajan's Persian victories, he fled by ship to Egypt with his family. He was expelled from the ship, and came to a place named Badyssus, where he lived fifteen years, when he was brought to Rome and roasted with his wife and sons in a brazen bull, like that of Phalaris (*Acta Sanctorum*, 20th September, p. 123).

This Iconian cult is an enigma; the celebration of the festival on 20th September distinguished it from the worship of St. Eustochius of Lystra and Vasada on 23rd June; yet the Bollandists have observed the possibility of confusion between the names; but I found out nothing further regarding it. It may be observed that the name Badyssus is distinctly Anatolian in type.

4. St. George on the Car, Araba-Yorgi, is a local form of St. George of Cappadocia, the patron Saint of England. The reason of his association with the waggon at Iconium I cannot explain. It is a remarkable and almost a unique phenomenon. Saints on horses are common, but saints on cars are unknown to me.¹ The pagan origin of this cult is especially clear. This saint is simply the sun-god Helios who drives forth each morning through the heavens in his four-horsed chariot, a common type in Greek art.

¹ Professor Strzygowski, who is a much more competent authority than I on such a matter, tells me that he knows nothing quite like this St. George on the Car.

The festival of St. George on the Car is celebrated on a mountain above Ladik. I have not seen the spot, but it appears to be not far from Sizma, and the cult may be regarded as the Christianized form of the religion of the Zizimene Mother. On this mountain at sunrise milk and water flow in a dry place: such is the story told me by a Greek who had not himself been present at the annual miracle. The legends of St. George may be found in the *Acta Sanctorum*, 23rd April, p. 123 ff.

The Christian festival takes place at sunrise on 23rd April, when a new year and a new summer are beginning. That milk should, on this occasion, flow in a dry place is a familiar phenomenon in pagan religion, an illustration of the bounty and power of the god. Usener has collected examples of this religious belief (as Professor Strzygowski reminds me) in an article on "Milk and Honey," printed in the *Rheinisches Museum*, 1902, p. 177 ff. In the panegyris on the mountain north of Iconium (if my informant is correct), water takes the place of honey; but in a land where water is so precious, and where artificial irrigation is absolutely necessary for agriculture, a bountiful flow of water was as valuable and divine a gift as nectar or honey. In fact there is a great ancient dam for storing water, a work of wonderful size, in the plain on the north side of the mountain, some hours east of Laodiceia. Usener has given many examples of the effect which this old pagan belief exercised on Christian ritual, where it even affected in some cases the Eucharist, so that bread and wine with milk and honey were given to the communicants.

The worship of the sun-god on mountain-tops was a widespread and characteristic feature of the religion of the Græco-Oriental world, and in the Christianized paganism of Byzantine ritual Helios became generally St. Elias, but local variations occur, as this St. George on the Car.

Besides these four popular festivals (all doubtless Christianized forms of older pagan feasts), there are many churches and holy places which are indubitably survivals of Byzantine cults.

Amphilochius was made archbishop of Iconium, when it was raised from the position of second city of the Province Pisidia to be metropolis of the new Province Lycaonia, about 371 A.D. He retained a high place in the veneration of the Iconian populace, probably not so much on account of his literary eminence and personal character, as because of his opposition to the Arians and his support of Basil. The hold which the struggle against the Arians had on the popular mind is shown by the inscriptions on a Cappadocian rock-church, specimens of which are published in the *Supplementary Papers* of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, i. p. 22. These rock-churches are certainly much later than the time of Basil and Amphilochius; yet they apostrophize the Arian Emperor Valens as if he were still living. Besides the shrine in the monastery of St. Chariton, St. Amphilochius has a church on the acropolis of Iconium, which is architecturally the oldest and the most interesting in the city. The quaint legend connected with the transformation of the church into its present form is told in *Pauline and Other Studies*, p. 170 f.

Thekla was the earliest Iconian Saint. Her name is a common personal name in Lycaonian inscriptions of the fourth and fifth centuries, and has been given to one of the twin peaks near Konia, which rises behind the village of Sille. At the southern edge of the ravine in which the village stands, also, there is a ridge of rocks in which the place is pointed out where Thekla was received into the sheltering bosom of the mountain. On the opposite side of the ravine is a rocky hillock that bears the name of the Syrian Saint Marina. The worship of Thekla has its origin

not in the historical personage, but in the desire of the Anatolian people for a female impersonation of the Divine power.¹ The same feeling caused the worship of St. Marina, and above all the cult of the Virgin Mother of God, the Panagia, who has a church in Sille, besides her shrine in the monastery of St. Chariton. She had also a church at Konia on the way out to the church of St. Eustathius ; but it fell into ruin, and has disappeared.

There is moreover a cult of St. George of old standing at Konia, and a church of the Holy Transfiguration on the acropolis. The great mosque of Ala-ed-din on the acropolis is also said to be a renovated church of St. Sophia ; but this seems a little doubtful.

A garden called Aimanas, on the south side of Iconium, perhaps retains the name of Ai (Hagios) Mannes, a martyr mentioned in an inscription on a column in the Mosque of Ala-ed-din.

At Sille there is a church of the Archangel Michael, the construction of which is attributed by tradition to Constantine and Helena. But Michael, the commander of the heavenly hosts and protector of the Christians, was more probably introduced into the worship of Iconium in the time of the Arab wars, when the Stratelates was regarded as the saviour of the people from the annual terrible raids of the Arabs. There are also churches or holy places of the Prophet Elias, of Ayios Panteleemon and of St. George, and a place called Ayanni (St. John) close to St. Marina.

These remains of Iconian ecclesiasticism take us back, not to early Christianity, but the Byzantine time, the fifth century or later. There is not a trace of anything that can be called early ; even the hills of St. Thekla and St. Philip are probably connected rather with Byzantine

¹ *Pauline and Other Studies*, pp. 133 f., 158 f.

superstition and the rehabilitation of paganism in Christian form than with the real historical personages whose name they bear. The one fact that remains in the local legend of St. Thekla is that she was received into the rocks ; an evident piece of old pagan belief. The Panagia cult was doubtless later than the Council of Ephesus, 431 A.D. ; and that of St. Amphilochius is evidently later than his death about 400 A.D., perhaps a good deal later.

We find ourselves here at Iconium in the same atmosphere as at Barata, as it is described in the EXPOSITOR, September and October, 1907, an atmosphere of saint-worship pronouncedly pagan in character, a revivification of paganism through the alliance between the orthodox Church and the superstition of the vulgar classes, who were too little educated to be capable of comprehending Christianity.

It is disappointing that in a place where the Christian power was continuous and the tradition unbroken from the earliest time, there should be such an utter want of early memory. The fact forms one more proof to confirm the general opinion that the Byzantine period was divided by an untraversable gulf from the true old Christian tradition, or rather that the old tradition was overlaid in that period with a vast stratum of paganizing superstition in character local Anatolian, which had never been eradicated from the minds of the native population. The unchanging East remained : all else had proved evanescent and transitory.

III. ST. PAUL'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE EMPERORS.

The attitude which the first Christians ought to take to the Roman Imperial Government was not one that could be clearly defined or easily determined.

The judgment of individuals must have differed considerably : the judgment of the same individual would almost

inevitably vary from time to time according to changes in the prevailing tone of administration and alteration in the personal point of view. The attitude of Paul himself altered materially during the period of his life that is best known to us. On the one hand the Imperial system was based on the most glaring and flagrant form of idolatry, the worship of a living man as the incarnate god on earth ; it was the direct enemy of Christ : its system was like a parody of the Christian Gospel. How could Paul do anything but hate it and condemn it ? On the other hand it saved the world from worse evils : every one who lived in those times knew that the Emperor and the Imperial Government alone stood between the civilized world and destruction, and restrained the power of disorder, war and savagery, which had recently so nearly overwhelmed society and put an end to civilization.

Something, nay much, was due to the Emperor, and the Lord's command was clear and definite, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." It was a delicate position for the adviser who had to counsel new converts, not very well educated in moral judgment, as to how they ought to regard the Imperial system ; and one can well understand that Paul's earliest words to a young Church should require subsequent interpretation and explanation.

Moreover, Paul at Thessalonica had found the Roman Administration the enemy of the Gospel. He was accused of treason to the Emperor and of setting up a rival Emperor and was practically condemned in absence by the magistrates. Their action, covered by the name of loyalty to Cæsar, made it impossible for him to return soon to Thessalonica, eager as he was to do so. This hindrance he speaks of as "Satan" ; and his language approximates to calling the Imperial system by that name.

The treatment which he had experienced in the Roman *Coloniæ*, Philippi, Lystra and Pisidian Antioch, in all of

which he suffered severely and was probably beaten with the staves of the lictors who attended on Roman magistrates, was calculated to confirm the unfavourable opinion which at one time he seems to have entertained of the Imperial Government as the enemy of the faith. The *Coloniæ* were outlying parts of Rome, peopled by Romans (for the non-Roman inhabitants were merely residents, not citizens) and governed by Romans; and for years the action of the magistrates in these *Coloniæ* towards him represented to him the feeling of the Roman State towards the Gospel and its adherents. That he endured personally at Pisidian Antioch as well as at Lystra, and that the vague words of Acts xiii. 50 conceal severe bodily suffering, seems clear from the language of the Apostle himself, 2 Timothy iii. 11: "Persecutions, sufferings: what things befell me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra; what persecutions I endured." It was only in *Coloniæ* that he could be beaten with the lictor's staves; and, as he had so suffered thrice, and he had been only in three *Coloniæ*, we must infer that his expulsion from Antioch and Lystra had been accompanied with chastisement administered by the lictors (which in itself may be assumed as customary when disorderly persons were ejected from a Roman town). Hence, at Philippi, Paul and Silas did not at first claim the rights of Roman citizens. Paul had not as yet begun to feel that Rome and Roman law might be a protection against barbarism and cruelty.

In Corinth we find that Paul's attitude towards the Imperial Government had altered. The decision of Gallio (which owing to the force of precedent in Roman administration was practically a charter of freedom for Christians to preach and teach, valid until reversed by some higher tribunal), had something to do with the change in his attitude towards the Government; but, probably, a more important cause lay in the development and the widening of his own

views, as he better understood the problem of the Roman world. He realized that the Empire was for the present the vehicle destined to carry the Christian Church, and that the Imperial Government was in a sense necessary to the Church. Further, he had learned that the Imperial administration was in practice quite disposed to be tolerant of the Church ; and there seems to have arisen in his mind the idea that Christianity might ultimately make itself, by peaceful growth, the religion of the peoples of the Empire. But that ultimate aim could not possibly blind him to the inevitable fact that there must be war against the great and crowning idolatry of the [Imperial cult, which was the keystone of the Imperial arch, and the basis of the Imperial unity.

Such was the dilemma with which Paul was confronted ; and his letters to the Thessalonians are to me intelligible only on the view that he was fully conscious of the dilemma. The Empire was the servant, the bearer, the instrument of the Church, and yet it was also its irreconcilable and inevitable foe. There could never be permanent peace between the Church and the Emperor, " who sitteth in the sanctuary of God, setting himself forth as God." But that war had not yet actually begun : much had to occur before it should begin. As yet the Emperor did not stand before them revealed in his real character. He was still the instrument of God, the restrainer of a worse evil. Ultimately, he should be revealed as he really was, the man of sin, the son of perdition, the enemy of God ; and then should come the great and final war. In that future time the Emperor, who now restrains the forces of disorder and barbarism, shall be disclosed as himself the great power and leader of barbarism and the enemy of all that is good. Every enemy of the truth shall then be allied against the Church, in the great battle which the seer of the Apocalypse foresaw at Har-Megiddo. But that is not yet. It is a matter

of the future ; and in fact such was the way in which the relation between the Empire and the Church developed during the following centuries, and so Paul foresaw with the eye of a statesman and a prophet.

This is the cryptic message of explanation to the Thessalonians, II. chap. ii. That message had to be expressed in very cautious and enigmatic language, significant only to the initiated. It was a dangerous truth, which might bring death to the young Church in Thessalonica ; for the letter might fall into the wrong hands, and such a truth must not be so plainly written that every person could understand it.

Is it too great a stretch of imagination to attribute to Paul such insight into the future course of history, and to recognize in the mystic words of that letter an anticipation of the Apocalypse of John ? Surely not. We see that the Imperial policy as defined by the ablest among the Emperors anticipated the inevitable approach of the conflict with the Church, and recognized the Church while still comparatively young and weak as the great enemy of the Imperial system in the future.¹ Paul was much more likely to see the character of the Empire than the Emperors to comprehend the nature of the Church. It is in truth as inconceivable that Paul could be insensible of the nature of the Imperial system, as it is that he could consent to any compromise with the Imperial worship.

There has been in recent years some tendency to exaggerate the contrast between the spirit of recognition of and allowance for the Empire, shown in Luke, most of the Pauline letters, and I Peter, and the spirit of defiance and detestation that animates the Apocalypse of John. The contrast is a very real one ; but it indicates no deep difference of opinion between the various writers. The difference of tone is due to change of circumstances. Paul's hatred of the enthroned lie, the Imperial false god, was as deep and strong

¹ See an article in the *Contemporary Review*, Sept. 1907.

as John's; and he knew equally well that in the end the Church must destroy the Imperial tyranny, or be killed by it. But he was content to wait till the future developed. In the meantime he recognized, not indeed in his earliest teaching, not when he first preached in Thessalonica, but in his writings from 2 Thessalonians onwards, that the power which maintained peace and order in the world was, in a sense, the friend and protector of the Infant Church.

A glorified and purified Empire was the Pauline idea; but a purified Empire meant the elimination of the God-Emperor. There could not be permanent peace between this god and the Church.

IV. A CHRISTIAN CITY IN THE BYZANTINE AGE.

The proper interpretation of inscription No. 5 in the article on this subject published in the EXPOSITOR for October has been partly suggested by M. Clermont Ganneau, partly added to his idea by myself. The existence of various lines and cuts on the stone gave in several cases the appearance of two letters in ligature, where the true interpretation proves that there were only single letters, and that the cuts are accidental. The inscription is, "Here lies Mousianos, who suffered many wounds."¹ There is here another reference to a war, which is not specified, similar to that in No. 6. This war, which is not specified because it was in the minds of all, must be the war against the Arabs. This inscription is late and rude, and must belong to the last century of the war, 865-965 A.D.

There can be little doubt that the restoration of Church I. at Bin Bir Kilisse (on which this inscription is engraved) took place at nearly the same time as the restoration of VI., for the work is done in exactly the same fashion, and that fashion is very remarkable architecturally.² I believe that

¹ ἔνθα κατὰ κίτε Μουσιανὸ[s] ὡ πωλὰς πλιγὰς ὑπωμίνας, ΓΙ is on the stone, where I formerly understood γι: now I see the letter intended was ΙΙ.

² Miss Bell will have much to say elsewhere about the restoration or rebuilding of these churches.

this sepulchral inscription, placed so conspicuously on the centre column of the great western doorway, is contemporary with the rebuilding of the church. An inscription of quite similar character and period is placed on the corresponding column of VI. (it has been published in the preceding article as No. 1). We have therefore the date of the restoration of these two churches as approximately A.D. 900. Church VI., as was stated, must have been built not later than the fifth century. Church I. is perhaps of that or the following century. It cannot be earlier, for a stone is built into its western front low down, which bears an imperfect inscription: the stone, therefore, was larger when the inscription was engraved on it, and this original block was cut down when it was built into the church. The inscription might belong to the later fourth or the fifth century.

As to the word Barata Professor D. S. Margoliouth writes to me that he regards the Arabic word Varta as being quite probably a borrowed word, taken from the Greek. His opinion therefore practically corroborates the judgment of Miss Bell and of Professor Sayce, who considered that the word could not belong originally to the Arabic stock. Professor Margoliouth informs me that the word Varta is freely used in Turkish literature. It seems, however, to be almost unknown in the conversational language, and (as I mentioned) we found only one Turk educated enough to know it; and even he at the first moment said that there was no such word in the language, though, after thinking, he remembered of its existence in a proverb.

The territory of Barata contained a forest. This fact is mentioned by two authorities. One is the legend of St. John in the Well, an obscure saint of this locality; he lived for a time in the forest of the people of Barata.¹ The other is the Arab geographer of the ninth century, Ibn Khordadbeh,

¹ ἐν τῇ ὄλῃ τῶν Βαρατέων. See my paper "Lycaonia" in the *Austrian Jahreshefte*, 1904, p., 117; and *Histor. Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 337.

who mentions Ras-al-Ghâba (the forest) on a road leading from Heracleia-Cybistra towards the west or north-west. Now trees are very rare on the central plateau of Asia Minor, where one may travel for many days without seeing a single tree. But there is in Kara-Dagh a real forest, dense, and containing well-grown trees ; it lies on the south side of the central peak in a sheltered valley : I have seen no other forest in all this country, north, south, east or west ; the nearest forest known to me is in the Phrygian mountains. Miss Bell, however, informs me that there are trees high up in Karadja Dagh, ten or twelve hours north-east of the Kara Dagh, though they do not grow either so dense or so tall as the wood in Kara Dagh. But it seems improbable that the forest mentioned by Ibn Khordadbeh, and impossible that the city of Barata, could have been situated in Karadja Dagh. The Forest of Barata is a detail which goes far to fix the locality of the city.

It is a not unimportant piece of evidence regarding the character of Barata in Byzantine time that in the whole course of our excavations we found not one single article that had even the most moderate artistic value or interest. Not a single scrap that was worth picking up off the ground was revealed by the spade. The excavations were, indeed, only superficial. The terms of our permission, and the limits of our financial powers, forbade deeper work, which might have revealed the civilization of an earlier. In the upper Byzantine stratum, which alone we touched, there is nothing. Art and learning were dead, as they must always die, when religion is enslaved and degenerate. The Byzantine church architecture survived, but it was the only survival of the art of the Graeco-Roman world in western Asia.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE PHILOLOGY OF THE GREEK BIBLE :
ITS PRESENT AND FUTURE.¹

II

THE PROBLEM OF " BIBLICAL " GREEK

IN our first lecture we called attention to the close connexion between the Greek Old Testament, represented by the Septuagint translation, and the Greek New Testament; and we described the new sources for the philological investigation of the Greek Bible. To-day we are to discuss briefly the great fundamental problem of Biblical philology, the problem of the language of the Greek Bible.

The essence of the problem is indicated at once by our manner of formulating it. We are to inquire not about Biblical Greek but about the language of the Greek Bible. This distinction is not a mere playing with words; it points to a fundamental principle of great importance.

Most of the earlier books on the subject were devoted to the investigation not of the language of the Greek Bible but of Biblical Greek, or of a part of it, namely, New Testament Greek.

Let us glance at a few titlepages. Edwin Hatch wrote *Essays in Biblical Greek*,² and H. A. A. Kennedy wrote on the *Sources of New Testament Greek*.³ Hermann Cremer's work, even in the ninth edition, in spite of the sharp criticism it has undergone, remains what it was

¹ These lectures were delivered in the Summer School of the Free Churches, at Cambridge, in July and August, 1907. In writing them I allowed myself the use of part of an address given by me at Giessen in 1897. The lectures were translated for me by Mr. Lionel R. M. Strachan, M.A., Lector of English in the University of Heidelberg.

² Edwin Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, Oxford, 1889.

³ H. A. A. Kennedy, *Sources of New Testament Greek: or the influence of the Septuagint on the vocabulary of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1895.

before, a "Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek."¹ The new German revision of Winer's Grammar appeared under the old title, *Grammar of the New Testament Idiom*,² and the late Friedrich Blass presented us with a *Grammar of New Testament Greek*.³

We even find this kind of title used by more recent scholars—Dr. J. H. Moulton,⁴ for example—but in these cases it is merely a formal concession to the older phraseology. With the older scholars, however, such a form of the title indicated a distinct peculiarity of scientific method, as is proved by such pointed sentences as the following. Hatch⁵ writes, "Biblical Greek is thus a language which stands by itself." Cremer⁶ adopts the words of Richard Rothe: "We can indeed with good right speak of a language of the Holy Ghost. For in the Bible it is manifest to our eyes how the Divine Spirit at work in revelation always takes the language of the particular people chosen to be the recipient and makes of it a characteristic religious variety by transforming existing linguistic elements and existing conceptions into a shape peculiarly appropriate to that Spirit. This process is shown most clearly by the Greek of the New Testament." And Blass, though the statements in his Grammar show, notwithstanding its title, that he afterwards altered his theoretical views on this question, remarked once in a review⁷ that New Testament Greek was

¹ H. Cremer, *Biblich-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität*, Gotha, 1866–8; neunte vermehrte Auflage, Gotha, 1902.

² G. B. Winer, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms als sichere Grundlage der neutestamentlichen Exegese*; achte Auflage, neubearbeitet von P. W. Schmiedel, Göttingen, 1894, 1897, 1898.

³ F. Blass, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen, 1896; zweite Auflage, Göttingen, 1902.

⁴ J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, based on W. F. Moulton's edition of G. B. Winer's Grammar*. Vol. i. Prolegomena. Edinburgh, 1906. Second edition, 1906. ⁵ *Op cit.*, p. 11.

⁶ In his Preface of 1883. The quotation is from Rothe, *Zur Dogmatik*, Gotha, 1863, p. 238.

⁷ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1894, xix., col. 338.

“to be recognized as something peculiar, obeying its own laws.”

These quotations could be increased by no small number of similar ones from other books. I believe that they are the expression of an opinion, still widely prevalent even at the present day, which, whether openly avowed or not, is far-reaching in its effects, particularly on exegesis. The Greek Bible, or at least the New Testament, is thus separated off from the bulk of the monuments of the Greek language that have come down to us from antiquity, in just the same way as, for example, the inscriptions in the Doric dialect might be collected into a special volume or section by some one who was editing all the Greek inscriptions extant. The Bible is thus isolated because it is supposed to be written in “Biblical” Greek, and the New Testament because it is in “New Testament” Greek, in a “language,” an “idiom,” a “Greek,” that must be sharply distinguished from the rest of what people have been so fond of calling “profane Greek.” They could only commit one more blunder by speaking of a Biblical or New Testament *dialect*. I have never met with this term in the literature of the subject, but I am sure it represents the popular conception in many quarters as to what the “language” of the Bible or the New Testament is.

This Greek, so people go on to argue, is outwardly, in comparison with other Greek, of unmistakable individuality, and inwardly it is uniform, subject to laws of its own, and possessing its own vocabulary. Even those words which are not to be reckoned among the specifically “Biblical” or “New Testament” words show for the most part a change of meaning that is often considerable and not infrequently is owing to the influence of the Hebrew or Semitic genius.

To sum up: the two fundamental notions most com-

monly met with in the older literature of the subject concerning the linguistic character of the Greek Bible are firstly the peculiarity, and secondly the uniformity of Biblical, or at least of New Testament Greek.

Those who support these two fundamental notions show more or less clearly by so doing their connexion with the earlier stages of research. The second idea in particular, that of the uniformity of Biblical Greek, is very old—as old as the earliest scientific speculation about the language of the Greek Bible. In the controversy of the Purists and Hebraists in the seventeenth century it was never for one moment questioned; it was a postulate for the theories of both parties.

And it is historically not difficult to understand; it is the simple consequence of them mechanically conceived doctrine of inspiration as applied to the New Testament. The extension of the idea to the Greek Old Testament, which is no doubt of recent date, probably originated in an equally simple backward inference from the New Testament. The idea, once established, was supported by the concept, also quite logical in its way, of what is Biblical in the literary sense, the concept of what is Canonical.

But how does this doctrine of the peculiar and uniform nature of Biblical Greek square with the facts? One thing seems clear to me from the outset: it is, to say the least, incautious to make this doctrine the starting-point of research.

And if we have given up the theory of mechanical inspiration, a glance at the history of the growth of the Greek Bible in its separate parts will make us still more distrustful. For this history shows us the possibility and the probability of temporal and local differentiation.

But the sacred texts themselves speak most clearly of all. They call emphatically for division on linguistic lines

into two great groups—original Greek writings, and translations of Semitic originals. Any one who does not respect this boundary line soon loses his bearings, especially in criticizing the syntactical phenomena of the Greek Bible. The boundary line, it is true, does not run in such a way that the Septuagint lies on one side and the books of the New Testament on the other. On the contrary, the sayings of Jesus in the synoptic Gospels, and perhaps more of the New Testament, must be counted with the examples of translators' Greek, while several of the so-called apocryphal books of the Old Testament, adopted by the Septuagint, go with the Greek originals.

These two groups differ very remarkably from each other in respect to their linguistic character. We might compare, for example, the Second Epistle to the Corinthian with the Greek version of Job. The original Greek writings are examples of Greek as it was really spoken; the Greek of the translations often shows traces of being influenced by the language of the original, and may sometimes be described as absolutely artificial, for it was not a spoken language but invented by the translators for their immediate purpose. We must not say, therefore, that this translators' Greek was so spoken by the Jews of Alexandria and Asiatics; we must not call it "Jewish Greek." The real spoken language of the Greek Jews is illustrated in the writings of Philo, who inclined rather to the use of the literary language, and in the Pauline Epistles, Jewish inscriptions and papyri, where we find more the colloquial language in its various grades.

Yet the non-Greek character of the translated books must not be exaggerated. I myself have formerly been less reserved in expressing my opinion on this point than I should be now. The Septuagint in many of its parts is not a non-Greek book if only we take as our standard not the classical

Attic of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. but the popular cosmopolitan Greek of the last three centuries B.C. Much that is non-Attic in the Septuagint is not necessarily non-Greek, but is proved by contemporary "vulgar" texts to be popular Greek.

We find, moreover, remarkable differences within the two main groups themselves, as was only to be expected. The translations were not made by one and the same hand, nor on a uniform method; for example, the sayings of our Lord in the Gospels are in general better translated than many parts of the Septuagint. How characteristic is the language of the Gospel and Epistles of St. John as compared with, say, the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Johannine Epistles are classical examples of the simplest popular language; the Epistle to the Hebrews exhibits a strong leaning towards the literary language.

In the face of these facts, therefore, we cannot assume that under the Ptolemies a uniform Greek for religious purposes grew up among the Egyptian Jews, and that under Tiberius, Claudius, etc., until right into the second century, this was also the language of Christians in Syria, Asia, Achaia, and Rome. These assumptions are now seen to be fictitious.

On the contrary, if we examine historically the language of the Old and New Testaments, our decided impression can only be this: Here we have side by side linguistic elements of essentially dissimilar types; and in stating and in solving our problem there can be no other point of view to be adopted except the historical.

A good deal of the uncertainty, however, which does nevertheless undoubtedly exist on this matter, arises from people's confusing the religious with the linguistic point of view in their historical examination. From the point of view of the history of religion the sacred books, despite their want of linguistic uniformity, must be taken together as

documents and memorials of two phases of revelation that are inseparable from one another. That is beyond doubt, and no less certain is it that the thoughts, the concepts, the spirit of the Greek Old Testament and of the New Testament are related, and that they differ characteristically in their main lines from the average faith of Graeco-Roman religion. But these are considerations dictated by the history of religion; they can play no part in the determination of a specifically Biblical or Christian Greek.

One single consideration drawn from the history of language speaks for a certain linguistic peculiarity and uniformity of the Biblical writings, though only in a formal sense. They must all be criticized as monuments of late Greek, and most of them as monuments of non-literary Greek, and with the express reservation that "late Greek" does not mean something sharply defined, always recognizable at once and with precision, but something fluctuating, often problematical, something which we do not fully know, a piece of living and therefore mysterious linguistic history.

There is no formula by which to describe briefly the characteristics of late Greek, and qualitative judgments describing it as "bad" Greek, and so on, are either uttered by doctrinaires regardless of history or echoed from the grammarians who fancied themselves able by their authority to prevent the changes and chances of things.

Greek philologists, enslaved to the prejudice that only the so-called classical Greek is beautiful, have long treated the texts of the later period with the greatest contempt. A good deal of their false judgments about late Greek is the simple consequence of their complete ignorance of it. The renaissance of Greek philology in our own day, owing to the progress of Epigraphy and Papyrology, has made amends for the neglect of late Greek by the older genera-

tion of scholars. At the present day there are plenty of accurate workers engaged in investigating philologically the newly discovered specimens of cosmopolitan Greek of the period from Alexander the Great to Constantine. I will mention only the most important : Dr. Wilhelm Crönert of Göttingen (*Memoria Graeca Herculanensis*);¹ Dr. Karl Dieterich, of Leipzig (*Investigations on the History of the Greek Language*);² Dr. Hatzidakis, the well-known Professor at Athens (*Introduction to Modern Greek Grammar*);³ Dr. van Herwerden, the veteran Dutch philologist (*Lexicon Graecum Suppletorium et Dialecticum*);⁴ Dr. Jannaris, the St. Andrews lecturer (*Historical Greek Grammar*);⁵ Dr. Kretschmer, of Vienna (*The Origin of the Koivῆ*);⁶ Dr. Mayser, a Stuttgart schoolmaster (*Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Ptolemaic Period*);⁷ Dr. Meisterhans and Dr. Schwyzer, two Swiss scholars (*Grammar of the Attic Inscriptions*);⁸ Dr. Nachmanson, a Swede (*Phonology and Morphology of the Inscriptions of Magnesia*);⁹ Dr.

¹ *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis. Cum titulorum Aegypti papyrorum codicum denique testimoniis comparatam proposuit Guilelmus Crönert. Lipsiae, 1903.*

² Karl Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache von der hellenistischen Zeit bis zum 10. Jahrh. n. Chr.*, Leipzig, 1898.

³ Georgios N. Hatzidakis (= Chatzidakis), *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1892.

⁴ Henricus van Herwerden, *Lexicon Graecum suppletorium et dialecticum*, Lugduni Batavorum, 1902, 1904 (two parts).

⁵ Antonios N. Jannaris (= Giannares), *An Historical Greek Grammar*, London, 1897.

⁶ Paul Kretschmer, *Die Entstehung der Koine*, Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, phil.-hist. Klasse, Band cxliii., Nr. 10.

⁷ Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*. Laut- und Wortlehre. Leipzig, 1906.

⁸ K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, Berlin, 1885; zweite Auflage, Berlin, 1888; dritte vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von E. Schwyzer, Berlin, 1900.

⁹ Ernst Nachmanson, *Laute und Formen der magnetischen Inschriften*, Upsala, 1903.

Wilhelm Schmid, the Tübingen Professor (*The Atticists*);¹ Dr. Wilhelm Schmidt, a Prussian schoolmaster (*De Flavii Iosephi elocutione*);² Dr. Wilhelm Schulze, a member of the Berlin Academy (*Graeca Latina*);³ Dr. Schweizer (*Grammar of the Inscriptions of Pergamos*),⁴ who now calls himself "Schwyzer" and has been already mentioned as the reviser of Meisterhans; Dr. Thumb of the University of Marburg (*The Greek Language in the Hellenistic Period*);⁵ Dr. Wackernagel, the Göttingen Professor of Comparative Philology (*Hellenistica*),⁶ and other scholars.

In this renaissance of Greek philology the Greek Bible has also been regarded with new eyes. It may now be described as the central object of the investigations into late Greek. Whereas formerly the qualitative judgments, "good" or "bad," prevented the clear recognition of its linguistic character, now, owing to its being brought into vital connexion with late Greek, floods of light are being shed upon the Bible. We may say that the Greek Bible is now seen to be, in its very nature and in its influence, the noblest monument of cosmopolitan late Greek.

This late Greek, including the original Greek of the Bible, is neither good nor bad; it bears the stamp of its age and asserts its own distinctive position in a grand process of development in the language, which, beginning in the

¹ Wilhelm Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, Stuttgart, 1887-97 (5 vols.).

² Guilelmus Schmidt, *De Flavii Iosephi elocutione observationes criticae*, Lipsiae, 1893; (from Fleckeisen's Jahrbüchern, Suppl. xx., pp. 345-550).

³ Guilelmus Schulze, *Graeca Latina* (Einladung zur akademischen Preisverkündigung), Göttingen, 1901.

⁴ Eduard Schweizer, *Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften*, Berlin, 1898.

⁵ Albert Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurtheilung der Κοινή*, Strassburg, 1901.

⁶ Jacobus Wackernagel, *Hellenistica* (Einladung zur akademischen Preisverkündigung), Göttingen, 1907.

earliest times, has lasted down to the present day. Late Greek has stripped off much that was customary in the earlier period, and it contains germs of future developments destined to be completed in Modern Greek.

We may then speak of a certain peculiarity and uniformity in original "Bible" Greek, but solely as opposed to earlier or later phases of the history of the language, not as opposed to "profane Greek."

The peculiarities of late Greek are most clearly discernible in the accidence. We are now so far advanced as to have established almost completely the morphology of the popular and colloquial forms of Hellenistic Greek. And we find that there is remarkable agreement between these forms and the forms that used to be considered peculiar to New Testament or Septuagint Greek.

From the lexical point of view there is also found to be great community between the Biblical and non-Biblical Greek.

As for the syntactical and stylistic peculiarities that formerly were considered the chief reason for isolating "Biblical" Greek, they also appear now in a different light. We have come to recognize that we had greatly over-estimated the number of Hebraisms and Aramaicisms in the Bible. Many features that are non-Attic and bear some resemblance to the Semitic and were therefore regarded as Semiticisms, belong really to the great class of international vulgarisms, and are found in vulgar papyri and inscriptions as well as in the Bible.

The number of real Semiticisms is therefore smaller than was supposed, and smaller than Julius Wellhausen,¹ for example, has recently declared it to be. But not one of the recent investigators has dreamt of denying the existence

¹ Julius Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, Berlin, 1905, p. 9 ff.

of Semiticisms. They are more numerous in the Septuagint than in those parts of the New Testament that were translated from the Aramaic ; but in the original Greek texts they are very rare.

In pronouncing on them philologically a distinction must be observed that was formulated by Hermann Paul¹ in a case of the same kind : the distinction between what is occasional and what is usual. Semiticisms are " occasional," for example, if they are brought about in a translation by the accidental influence of the original from which the translation is made ; they are " usual " if, for example, they have become stereotyped in " sacred formulas " or other phrases. A certain number of these " usual " Semiticisms were moreover coined by the Septuagint, and may therefore, as Theodor Nægeli² well suggested, be called Septuagintisms.

What we do deny is merely this : that the Semiticisms, particularly those of the New Testament, are sufficient reason for scholars to isolate the language of our sacred texts. Our opinion of the Biblical language is reached by considering its innumerable coincidences with the cosmopolitan language, not its numerable differences from it. The Semiticisms do not place the Bible outside the scope of Greek philology ; they are merely birthmarks. They show us that in this great cosmopolitan Book the Greek cosmopolitan language was spoken by men whose home lay in the East.

ADOLF DEISSMANN.

¹ Hermann Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, 3. Auflage, Halle, 1898, pp. 67, 145.

² Theodor Nægeli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*, Göttingen, 1905, p. 74.

ST. PAUL IN ATHENS.

THE episode, St. Paul in Athens, marks an epoch in the history of the human race a correct appreciation of which is of equal value to the philologist, the historian, and the theologian. I, for my part, am endeavouring to contribute to this as I fix my attention first of all upon the external circumstances of the narrative as related in Acts xvii. To this investigation I am the more inclined, and to a certain extent committed, as in my *History of the City of Athens* (p. 262) I put forward a view which differs in important points from the traditional conception, and which, I cannot fail to recognize, contains what at first sight will seem strange. For a like reason do the evangelical ministers in Athens still lead the members of their communities to the rocky hill of the Areopagus, endeavouring to realize the more vividly the Apostle's words on the spot where they are supposed to have been uttered.

I am convinced that whoever, unbiassed by any theory, will allow himself to be influenced by the account given in the Acts, he will find it impossible to escape the impression that the incident has been depicted by a well-informed and trustworthy witness. Such an abundance of historical material is contained in the sixteen verses of the text, there is in it all such a depth of meaning and such an individuality, it is so full of life and so characteristic! There is no mere empty formal verbiage and stereotyped conformity to model as would be the case were one relating a fabricated tale. It is also impossible to establish any "purpose" in the story which could lend any probability to a designed invention. In order rightly to understand the account we must be familiar with Athenian life.

The market-place of Athens was for the world a stage whereon every new learning had to undergo its test. Athens

was pre-eminently that city where discourses upon higher truth could be certain of engaging the general interest. Therefore St. Paul acted here just like Socrates, entering day by day into conversation with those who met him in the street (ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ κατὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν πρὸς τοὺς παρατυγχάνοντας [διελέγετο]). So the report of a διδαχὴ καινὴ of a quite peculiar kind was spread abroad. The market became filled with a public disposed to listen, both residents and strangers; and the philosophers, who here were spokesmen; were invited to measure themselves with the casual teacher of wisdom. To allay their curiosity they induce St. Paul to discourse at greater length, and endeavour to give to the expected speech a higher consequence by causing the magistrates of the city to take part in it (ἤγαγον ἐπὶ τὸν Ἄρειον πάγον).¹ This cannot mean that they led him to a rocky hill situated at a distance from the market, for the market has ever remained the place where business is transacted and the public of the market always remained the same, neither was any one to be found upon the bare top of the rock. There the criminal judges assembled only on appointed days of the month to pronounce sentence in solemn session under the open sky. The office of the archon-king, where law-suits were instituted, was down below in the market in the King's Hall. It is here that Euthyphro, in the introduction to Plato's *Dialogue*, presents himself to apply for an indictment for murder; it is here that he meets

¹ ἐπὶ c. accus. is the proper expression to signify a going or leading when to a public board of magistrates; so in Herod. iii. 156: ἦγον δὴ μιν οἱ πύλοιοι ἐπὶ τὰ κοινά: and iii. 46, καταστάντες (in the sense of *deducti* or *producti*) ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας. Likewise viii. 79, στάς ἐπὶ τὸ συνέδριον. Where there is no conception of movement ἐπὶ c. gen. in sense of *coram* takes its place; ἐπὶ ματέρων, ἐπὶ βασιλέως, ἐπὶ Θεῶν. In the case of the Areopagus a misunderstanding could arise through the habit of using from ancient times, instead of the complete title ἡ βουλή ἢ ἐξ Ἄρειου πάγου, the name of the place for that of the assembly which held diet there.

Socrates, who has been indicted for crimes against religion and ancestral custom. For cases coming under the jurisdiction of the Areopagus an especially close preliminary investigation took place, and it is probable that in olden times the King's Hall was used for this preliminary investigation, the Areopagites taking part in it.¹ It is certain that in the Roman time the court of Areopagus had a place for business in the market.

At that time the Areopagus was entrusted with various powers to provide for order and good behaviour in a city which was always in a state of agitation. It was the supreme police authority, as we can infer from its powers in the matter of buildings and statues, and it is very probable that a committee of the Areopagus, sitting in the market hall, was also entrusted with a superintendence over the market traffic in order to take steps against unlawful and turbulent movements.

This much is clear, that in Acts there can be no reference to the sacred place of meeting on the rocky hill. It is no lawsuit, no indictment, that is taking place. It was merely the philosophers' mode of giving a more emphatic expression to their curiosity. They had then no ground for leading St. Paul away from the market hall to the exposed height which was the most unsuitable place imaginable for assemblies and speeches. The Agora, on the contrary, where the philosophers daily carried on their intercourse, was well suited to speaking and hearing. It was a large space surrounded with pillars, in which religious and political assemblies were held, and was separated from the space in front which lay to the north, the market-place proper, where the

¹ The place of the *προδικασίαι* is nowhere stated. According to Schömann, *Gr. Antiq.*, i. p. 496, and Philippi, *Areop.* p. 85 ff., they took place on the Areopagus. For such legal preliminary inquiries the sacred place of assembly, according to my view, was unsuited.

money changers' tables, the stalls and shops, lay close together, and where the most restless activity prevailed (*History of Athens*, p. 172 f.). In front of the Stoa Basilike stood the seats of the Areopagites, who were installed there as an executive committee. If they sat in a semi-circle, St. Paul could stand ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Ἀρείου πάγου, and yet be intelligible across the market-place to the crowd which pressed together in a motley ring in front of the Stoa.

The Areopagites are not the most important persons in the scene, but the citizens and the strangers present. St. Paul is addressing the Athenians and not the Areopagites. It is a popular address, and not a speech to a court, and it is only because he could not help supposing that malevolent listeners would gladly have laid a trap for him, accusing him of proclaiming new gods, that he makes the ingenious application of the altar to the unknown god. As the assembly had only come together casually, so also it breaks up in an informal manner. At the word ἀνάστασις all becomes noise and confusion.

As regards the history of religion Athens was a place perfectly unique. On the one hand it was the home of the cult of the most high deity, not honoured by any image, (Ζεὺς ὑψίστος) to which the Athenians always remained faithful. The simple holydays of the highest deity of heaven remained the most venerable popular feasts. On the other hand, the city was the most brilliant reflection of the polytheistic world because every form of divine worship was here fostered with especial piety, and from ancient times the supreme intention was to make Athens a central point where every Hellene should feel at home. We learn from inscriptions how in the time of Lycurgus even non-Greek institutions were favoured (*Hist.*, p. 218). In Hellenistic times, owing to the active relations with eastern princes, foreign worships were introduced in considerable numbers. The religious

fidelity of the Athenians, their *εὐσέβεια*, degenerated into a superstitious terror of the gods, a *δεισιδαιμονία*. It was feared that the deities who were overlooked by them would make them atone for it. Therefore Athens was, more than all other Greek cities, inundated with idols, a *πόλις κατείδωλος*, a word not occurring elsewhere. Athens formed a contrast to cities like Ephesus, where the old native worship of Zeus, the dispenser of blessings, was extinguished in the oriental pantheism of the worship of Artemis, and at the same time this had darkened all other forms of worship. Athens was the place where the religious history of heathendom was most clearly portrayed on Greek soil. In the midst of the bewildering throng of idols St. Paul could find a point of contact [for his new doctrine] in the fundamental feature of the monotheistic view of the Deity, which here had never been extinguished, the faith in an unconditioned Supreme Being, the *πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε* whose image reposed indelibly in the depth of the soul, with whom men felt themselves united as participators in His nature and as belonging to one family. As St. Paul, expressing the inmost thought of the Greeks, says, He is the First Cause of all life, *ἐν ᾧ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμεν* : not, however, an inconceivable, pantheistic existence, but a personal God, near to each individual, *οὐ μακρὰν ἀπὸ ἐνός ἐκάστου*, who may be recognized and found of him who seeks Him. The original connexion with God is dimmed and relaxed; men withdraw and become estranged from the life that is in God (*ἀπαλλοτριούνται τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Ephes. iv. 18). The consciousness of God is being darkened under the misleading influence of the service of idols which is penetrating into the country. The truth which was contained in the original worship at the altar of the God of heaven is being renounced—that is the *μετάλλαξις τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει*

(Rom. i. 26)—and the increasing separation from God is shown in the neglect of the divinely appointed ordinances of nature, and the springing up of unnatural vices (*χρήσις ἢ παρὰ φύσιν*) to the dishonour of the body which God had created. But God has withdrawn Himself from rebellious men and allowed them to wander in their own ways (*παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν*).

What is here given is sufficient to show how far the Apostle's thoughts travelled beyond the educational limits of his own nation. He recognizes how God has also been guiding the Gentiles to whom he imparted no other revelation than that contained in Nature and the requirements of the human consciousness. Moreover he endeavours to comprehend from the historical side the religious life of the heathen world. These are points of view which could only occur to the mind of one who was familiar with Hellenic modes of thought.

After gaining this conviction I could not withstand the inducement to follow up from the philological standpoint the traces of these Greek modes of thought in the Pauline writings, and I put together concisely what I observed without claiming any systematic treatment or exhaustive completeness.

I begin with the Pauline description of Christian moral life. It is here that I have most distinctly perceived the influence of the Greek way of looking at life. It is in the Epistle to the Philippians, to whom he pours out his heart in the warmest manner, chap. iv. 8: *ὅσα ἀληθῆ, ὅσα σεμνά, ὅσα δίκαια, ὅσα ἀγνά, ὅσα προσφιλή, ὅσα εὐφήμα, εἴ τις ἀρετὴ καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος, ταῦτα λογίζεσθε*. The words stream from his lips to meet a prejudice that the Christian faith demanded a one-sided contraction of the natural disposition and injured the free evolution of intel-

lectual life. Like a healthy tree, it should grow to full bloom. Everything that is good in humanity should be the goal of our exertions. The inner connexion with Greek ethics is most clearly expressed in the word *εὐφημα*, which in the New Testament occurs in this passage alone, and which, in an expression which cannot be adequately translated, signifies the delicacy which guards the lips, that nothing may be expressed in public worship that could disturb devotion or give rise to scandal.

Near akin to what pertains to the grace of Hellenic life is the Apostle's warning not to indulge their own humour in their daily discourse, but that it should be wisely weighed, and should be seasoned with salt like a well-prepared dish, in order to gladden their neighbours (Col. iv. 6: *ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἄλατι ἡρτυμένος*). So the Attic salt is introduced into Christian ethics, and so too is the popular form of greeting among the Greeks adopted. The old formula receives, in the form *χαίρειν ἐν Κυρίῳ*, a new meaning—is consecrated to a new purpose. It was imparted by St. Paul to the new communities not merely as a casual salutation, but as a fixed motto for their whole life; *χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ πάντοτε, πάλιν ἐρῶ, χαίρετε* (Phil. iv. 4).

To these echoes of Greek manners I join another word which is far from being confined to Pauline usage, *εὐαγγέλιον*, and which seems to me to be derived in like manner from the popular views held by the Greeks. It was a genuine Greek trait to assign special importance to the first announcement of a fortunate discovery, a victory, a conclusion of peace. The shepherd, Pixodarus, who happened to discover the stone quarries at Ephesus, received the eponym "Euangelos" (Vitruv. x. 7). Hermes himself bore this name. A priestly caste among the Milesians was called "Eungelidæ" (Conon. Narr. 44). In Attic dedicatory inscriptions we see messengers of good tidings

represented with galloping chargers. It was in the Greek sense, therefore, that St. Paul said (Rom. xv. 19 f.) that he had his "glorying" in this, that he first had brought to Europe the joyous message of Him who had become the salvation of mankind. He added, in order to obviate any misconstruction, that it was no ostentatious forwardness on his part (*καυχήσις*), but that he had no alternative—that it was a divine *ἀνάγκη*. Cp. Aristophanes, *Knights*, 643: *λόγους ἀγαθούς φέρων εὐαγγελίσασθαι πρῶτος ὑμῖν βούλομαι*. The term *συνείδησις*, so important in Pauline theology, in the sense of consciousness of sin, was familiar to the ancients. We also find *πίστις*, in the sense of fidelity, near *ἀρετή* and *σοφία* presented in the relief which contains the Apotheosis of Homer.

Finally, I point to how living an idea in St. Paul is that of proportion, so characteristic of the Greeks. According to the idea of organism which Aristotle perfected, he sees the members of the body bound to mutual service, *ἐν μέτρῳ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου μέρους*. Proportion prevails also in the spiritual world, and the old *μηδὲν ἄγαν* is expressed by the Apostle in the form that God forbids him to exceed proportion in his words (*οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον του κανόνος, οὗ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς μέτρον*, 2 Cor. x. 13).

From these conceptions, which obtained a value in the natural character of the ancients, and now, like gold pieces out of the treasure of Greek ethics, were put again into circulation at a new valuation, are distinguished the ideas which essentially dominated and shaped the historical life of the ancients,—above all, the idea of the State as the Society in which alone human faculties could develop according to nature. Whereas in the Gospels the pictures borrowed from human life are principally connected with the occupations of agriculture, cattle breeding, and fishing,

we find in St. Paul a new conception of life. He cannot imagine the cultivated man not forming part of a State; the course of life and citizenship are to him synonymous. Nothing shows that more clearly than the sentence with which he begins his defence before the Sanhedrim; *ἐγὼ πάσῃ συνειδήσει ἀγαθῇ πεπολίτευμαι τῷ Θεῷ*. God is the Law-giver. "As a citizen of the City of God, I have without blame discharged my obligation." In conformity with the Greek point of view, he conceives his human duties as the duties of a citizen; and when he cites *φόβος* and *ἀγάπη* as the sources of genuine civic duty, this corresponds to the teaching of Aristotle that veneration for the laws must find its complement in the *φιλία* between the citizens.

With the conception of a State and citizenship are connected the legal institutions which derive their validity from the State. There are here two special forms of civic order which are of importance in Pauline doctrine. The first is *διαθήκη*, a word employed by St. Paul, in conformity with classical usage, in two senses—a testamentary disposition and a covenant; while Luther only introduced the word in its first sense. The other term, which belongs to the laws regulating family procedure, is Adoption, the religious realization of which the Apostle has very much at heart. What in ordinary language is expressed by God giving men a filial spirit towards Himself is defined in legal language as a Divine contrivance for uniting again with Himself, by the process of adoption, mankind which had fallen away. It is as when life is restored to a desolate house and a new posterity is obtained. This legal conception is applied by St. Paul in a threefold sense. It is transferred to the election of Israel (Rom. ix. 4), to the relation of the Christian Church to God (Rom. viii. 15), and lastly to the glorified condition of the children of God in

full enjoyment of the privileges of sonship which have been promised through the adoption—the crowning consequence of *προορίζειν εἰς υἰοθεσίαν*.

In contrast with the forms of worship in oriental heathendom, which had stiffened into sluggishness or degenerated into ecstatic fanaticism, nothing in popular Greek life was more characteristic than the union of athletic contests with the religious festivals. No author of the Hellenistic period has the contests of the games more clearly before his eyes than the Apostle. I draw attention only to the expressions *διώκειν τὴν δικαιοσύνην, στέφανος ἀπόκειται, βραβεῖον*. Even the rare *καταβραβεύειν* is not wanting. It forms a complete circle of thought in which he likes to move, and it is no mere accessory, but is in the closest connexion with the very essence of his doctrine of salvation. With a sure and intimate knowledge, and a rare intelligence, he knows how to turn cleverly to account all the details like the *ἐγκρατεύεσθαι* (1 Cor. ix. 25) of the athletes, in order to turn to account such points of view as could typify the Christian life. Expressions like *τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτείνεσθαι* (Phil iii. 13) show us in the most vivid way the body of the runner stretched forward as he is nearing the goal, just as he was represented in the life-like bronze statues of the Olympic victors. Neither is an honourable love of fame disowned by the Apostle, as is shown by his repeated use of *φιλοτιμέομαι* and likewise *εἰ τις ἔπαινος* quoted above.

These ways of looking at things have their roots in classical times. On the contrary, all that has a military connexion belongs to an age of Hellenism, in which militarism had been developed, but which is felt to lie entirely outside the idea of a civil commonwealth. Mercenaries were quite a regular institution in Cilicia, and St. Paul knew how to gain from these circumstances amid which he had been brought up a meaning ready to hand for his mis-

sion. The warrior who is not engaged in the providing of means of sustenance, and looks only to the master in whose service he is, is a type of the Apostle's position and of that of his comrades (2 Tim. ii. 4), and, therefore, he calls Epaphroditus his fellow-soldier (*συστρατιώτης*).

From the profession of Art also there is no lack of intimation to show how St. Paul lived his life within the Greek world. The word *στῦλος*, which came more and more into use for *κίων* is used to designate men who are pillars of the community (Gal. ii. 9). *Τύπος*, the mould in which are cast figures in relief, betokens the settled form which the new doctrine had acquired (*τύπος διδαχῆς*, Rom. vi. 17), and at the same time the model that we should present in life, the *exemplum imitandum* (1 Cor. x. 6). In Athens St. Paul refers to the works of art in the precious metals and marble by one common expression—*χαράγματα τέχνης καὶ ἐνθυμήσεως*. By this expression he can mean nothing else than the thoughts which men put into their works; apart from the technical side they are the source from which the works of art spring, and St. Paul uses the rare word to show how foolish it is to render divine honours to objects which have been produced in accordance with one's own fancy.

That St. Paul was no stranger to Greek science, we recognize from the fact that he characterizes the Greeks as a people in search of wisdom; and of all the scientific work which Alexandria afforded, nothing must have had a greater charm for him, restless missionary as he was, than the information about countries and peoples that was collected and arranged there.

The sphere of operations of the Apostle of the Gentiles did not present itself to him as an unlimited world (*κόσμος*), but a world in the sense in which the Alexandrians interpreted *οἰκουμένη*. In this sense he speaks in Romans

x. 18 of the "ends of the world." It is the world which is inhabited by Greeks, then the Græco-Roman world of which the emperors were termed the masters and founders. Within this sphere Eratosthenes had compared together the three South European peninsulas as forming the most important portions of the ancient world. To them had St. Paul particularly directed his attention. Of these, he conceives the eastern as forming one whole, as did also Eratosthenes, and unites Macedonia with Achaia as one district for a common generosity towards the poor brethren in Jerusalem (Rom. xv. 26).

To contemplate the history of the nations from the point of view of their geographical situation, to which expression is given in the speech before the Athenians, is also agreeable to Eratosthenes, who brought geography and history into their proper connexion. While in the Old Testament the nations of the earth were only arranged on genealogical principles, here it is a matter of *ὁροθεσία* according to the genuine Greek conception. To every nation not only the time limits have been assigned within which it flourished, but also the space limits within which it should fulfil its historical vocation.

As regards the religious life of the Greeks, we have already seen how St. Paul was able to recognize in its purity the old Pelasgic worship which preceded the idol worship that had penetrated in its place, and how he was able to find in it a point of contact for his doctrine. He applies to himself one only, and that the simplest, of the forms of worship, the *σπονδή*, using the expression—twice in a noteworthy manner—*σπένδειςθαι* of the service of a Christian sacrificing himself in faithful submission to his God (Phil. ii. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 6).

The more, however, he opposes temple and statue worship, the more was he in sympathy with the view which

had been especially formed among the Athenians that the knowledge of the Deity was no concern of the general crowd, but of a select company, a narrower community, which guards the contemplation of the Divine as a secret entrusted to it. The mysteries went up in respect in the same degree as public worship had lost in value, and in the Alexandrian age the knowledge of God is called *μύστις τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιστήμης* (*Sap. Sal. viii. 4*). In the New Testament, expressions relating to mysteries are nowhere more frequent than in St. Paul. He employs *μεῖν* (*initiare*) to express the development of his moral and religious consciousness (*Phil. iv. 12*), and he calls himself the bearer of divine secrets like an Eleusinian hierophant.

I should be inclined to believe that *τέλειος*, in the sense of the perfect man, is connected with *τέλη* (*τελετή*), and denotes the man who has accomplished all the steps of initiation.

There are many kinds of references to the philosophy of the ancients after it became an ethical philosophy.

When St. Paul gives warning of the false teachers of his time, an opposition becomes manifest very akin to that between the Socratic school and the Sophists: first of all outwardly in his not offering his teaching for sale, but of free love imparts the teaching of salvation in order to help mankind (*ἀδάπανον θήσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, *1 Cor. ix. 18*). Then he characterizes these false teachers as men who do not make men better. He marks with a Platonic expression the sophistical art of persuasion which busies itself with secondary matters and leads men astray (*ἐν πιθανολογία παραλογίζεσθαι*, *Col. ii. 4*). He lashes the false *παιδεία* which neglects the true aims of human education (*ἀπαιδευτοὶ ζητήσεις*, *2 Tim. ii. 23*). Compare such expressions as *μωραὶ ζητήσεις*, *βέβηλος κενοφωνία*, to denote the meaningless discourses of his opponents (*πάντοτε μανθάνοντες καὶ μηδέποτε εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν δυνάμενοι*): ever

teaching and learning, they never come to the knowledge of the truth, and give men no sound food for spiritual life (*ὕγιαίνοντες λόγοι*).

The close union in St. Paul between knowledge and virtue is also truly Platonic. The darkening of the understanding is estrangement from God (*ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ*, Eph. iv. 18). He defines as the aim of Christian life the *πληροφορία τῆς συνέσε* (Col. ii. 2), and warns his people not to be rocked to and fro like young children by changing views.

Very Hellenic and Platonic is St. Paul's conception of freedom as the inalienable right of human nature, his defence against every constraint of literalism. Just as among the ancients the *ἄγραφα νόμιμα* were the holiest, so also should God's commandments not stand over against men as an external statute, but should be written in their hearts (*ὁ νόμος γραπτὸς ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις*, Rom. ii. 15), and he recognizes the evidence for the validity of the Divine commands in the fact that unspoiled men, by following the guidance of their conscience, recognize its truth, and, by a critical weighing of each side of the moral question, arrive at the same goal (*λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων*).

The devoted investigation of truth raises men above their natural relations. There arises from those who accept the teaching of Socrates a new stock which looks upon Socrates as their spiritual ancestor. Athenians, Bœotians, Eleans become *Σωκρατικοί*. So does St. Paul also call Timothy his son. As the Academicians withdrew from the city defiled by the death of Socrates and founded a new Society, so should Christians be a new family though in the midst of the old world (*ἄμωμοι μέσον γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης*, Phil. ii. 15).

As mankind since Socrates became looked upon as in

want of conversion and improvement, so also did Nature appear sunk and in decay; and when St. Paul speaks of corruption (*φθορά*) which weighs like a heavy fatality on the creature, we are involuntarily reminded of Plato, who describes clearly in the fragment of his Critias how all Nature—mountains and islands, vegetation and springs, is in a diseased, stunted condition, and falls far short of its original efficiency.

The comparisons which I have pointed to in these reflections are not intended to lead to surprising or strange results. That cannot be my intention, as though new wine were being put into old bottles. But it is inconceivable that a language like Greek, the inheritance of the nation richest in culture, should have been used as the organ for conveying the new teaching without an abundance of ancient conceptions and views streaming into it. It remains one of the most important tasks of the history of moral culture to recognize the productive and stimulating elements which have passed from the old possession to the new. St. Paul did not learn Greek by study, as a missionary learns the language of the natives in order to acquire the bare power of making himself intelligible. He did not acquire the language for missionary purposes, but had grown up in the use of it. Formerly it was the custom to point out Cilician provincialisms in his writings. It was not the country, however, but the capital that formed the cradle of his education. Tarsus was the most esteemed seat of learning next to Alexandria. Tarsus had the advantage of being an old city on the frontier of Syria and Asia Minor, situated on sea and river, an ancient focus of oriental and western civilization. It was not an artificial city like Alexandria, where learning was artificially fostered in Court and State institutions, but Hellenism had been accepted by the native population. It was no meeting-

place where the different elements of the population which was drawn to the place continued to remain strangers. Strabo expressly brings into prominence the fact that the many celebrated Tarsians, of every branch of science and art, were natives of the place. Tarsus was the Athens of Asia Minor. As the geographer so enthusiastically recognizes, a general desire of learning animated the citizens, and served to blend harmoniously their different component parts. So also the Jewish inhabitants, who were naturally present in large numbers at this great universal market, could be here most easily Hellenized. And so much was Greek the general language of literature that St. Paul quotes the old Testament writings according to the Greek text.

If St. Paul's parents had already acquired the Roman citizenship, it becomes thereby evident how precisely this house had become intimately connected with the Græco-Roman world. He is the only Apostle who entered on the mission with a Roman name, and this name was not unusual in his home, as the historian Menander testifies: *Παῦλος ὁ Κίλιξ* (*Frag. Gr. Hist.*, iv. p. 245).

In this atmosphere did the Apostle grow up assimilating its influences with active mind. It was impossible to learn Greek speech without at the same time learning to think and feel as a Greek. We find in him a lively variety of style and an abundant supply of language, such as is not easily attained in the case of a language designedly acquired. Besides, he employs rare words, which must have been remote from daily use, and he shows the most delicate sense in the use of verbal forms. He knows how to stir the tenderest chords of our feelings. He is at home in conducting a train of reasoning and in that lively form of discussion that was acquired in the law courts. He has always poetical images at command as they become a

Pindar or an Æschylus. I recall only the bold picture in Colossians, where he calls the law a *σκιά τῶν μελλόντων*. The Person of the Saviour is the historic reality, the body which, so long as the sun is low in the heavens, is unrecognizable, and only throws its shadows far over mankind until when the sun stands high the substance becomes visible and the shadow disappears. Romans viii. 22, *ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει*, is also an evidence of poetic power in feeling and language. The inhabitants of Lystra are the best witnesses how completely Greek St. Paul had become when they wanted to bestow on him the honours of a Hermes—*λόγιος* (Acts xiv. 12).

So also was St. Paul called to speak in the market at Athens, and by virtue of his Greek education he had a subtle appreciation of the religious feature of the oldest city. But the Semite is not submerged in the Greek, and on that fact rests the full significance of his appearance in Athens.

The interchange of relations between Aryans and Semites on Greek soil has a history which extends through centuries. The economic life of Hellas was founded, and its inhabitants were drawn into, the traffic of nations through seafaring Semites. In proportion as the national consciousness was formed foreign influences receded. First in the Socratic period, as universal human interests asserted themselves, the intermingling of these nations became freer, and the Semitic peoples could also share in the Greek intellectual work. The example of the Stoa shows how one of the most important schools of philosophy was essentially under Semitic influence. Foreign Stoics became Greeks.

St. Paul was the first Semite, belonging to a select tribe of the race, who remained true to his people and brought its most valuable possession, the energy of religious life and pure conception of God, in the Greek language to Hellas.

He thereby stepped into the great gap in Greek education.

It has indeed been said that Greek polytheism was still at that time at its height, and that the wonderful success of the homely messenger is thereby rendered all the more incomprehensible. But how can the worship of the gods be spoken of as flourishing when already after the Peloponnesian War men like Lysander received divine honours, when the Divine name was appended like an ornament to whole dynasties and Roman governours were deified? The significance of the Olympian gods depended upon the exclusiveness of their circle; they were a reality in national consciousness as the bearers of national ideas. When the national consciousness grew weaker, and foreign worships luxuriated side by side with the national gods; when to these former course was had for safety, the established public worship could claim no respect, and those who had religious wants sought their satisfaction elsewhere.

This spiritual state was met by Judaism with its twofold offer, for which a special welcome was manifested. One was the Sabbath rest, which was experienced as a benefit in the restless activity of the day. The second was the raising of their minds to a Supreme Being, who was worshipped without statue or temple. It was those Greeks and Romans who were susceptible to this influence, who, because they would know only of a superterrestrial God, were taunted as worshippers of the sky and as cloudgazers ("cælicolæ—nil præter nubes et cæli numen adorantes," *Juv.* xiv. 95).

Religious circles of this kind were marked by the expressions *σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν, σεβόμενοι, εὐλαβεῖς, εὐσεβεῖς* (treated of by Bernays in his *Collected Works*, ii. 71 ff.). How the Gospel was received by such circles is seen by the first missionary journey made by St. Paul and St. Barnabas on European soil. They go down the river from Philippi to where they might expect to find a place for prayer

(οὐ ἐνομιζόμεν προσευχὴν εἶναι, Acts xvi. 13). If this expectation was not altogether ungrounded, they must have been relying on the analogy of other places. There were then shady places here and there where men were to be met in whom the two missionaries hoped to find sympathy. As the school of Plato used to withdraw from the city to the river valley in the country, so also did persons from among the people, who felt themselves repelled from the city image worship, seek out such places before the gates, where, without belonging to a Jewish community, they fostered a pure worship of God on Sabbath days. The whole communication, however laconic, affords us nevertheless a glance into the condition of the Greek people which otherwise would escape our historical knowledge.¹

We can also recognize how Hellenism was influencing Judaism, as the Greeks sought to borrow from Judaism, as its chief content, the feature that must have interested them most—the indissoluble connexion between wisdom and pure morals, the claims of a spiritual worship of God without requiring the acceptance of the Mosaic Law. In Alexandria, this intention was the cause of the appearance of the Book of Wisdom; and I can well believe that in such cities as received Greek colonization early, like Samaria, such an influence was at work, endeavouring to transform the substance of Judaism into a free form of religion.

We find, then, three phases of Judaism in the period of Hellenism. First, that which prevailed at Herod's court, loudly priding itself on being more Greek than Jewish; a second, which, without disowning Judaism, sought to make it more accessible to foreigners as an enlightened mono-

¹ That *προσευχή* is also used for synagogue is clear from *Bullet. de Corresp. Hellen.*, xiii. 129; *Corp. Inscript. Gr.*, ii., add. 2114b, n. 66; *Vgl. Schürer, Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes*, ii. p. 330. But every *προσευχή* is not therefore a synagogue and the existence of such could not have been the subject of a conjecture.

theism ; and, finally, that according to which all who wished to share in the worship of Jehovah must bow beneath the yoke of the law. This party took up such an exclusive position that Josephus, in accordance with the Pauline use of *πολιτεύεσθαι* mentioned above, says of himself, *ἐπολιτευόμεν τῇ τῶν Φαρισαίων αἵρέσει συνακολουθῶν*. St. Paul joined this party with all the energy of his fiery spirit, though, at the same time, not without an inner scruple. For if I look merely at what the words *σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν* (Acts xxvi. 14) mean, it appears to me impossible to find in them an expression suited to one now for the first time entering on a disobedient course, but a foolish, refractory temper of long standing is meant. I must assume, then, from this expression, that St. Paul had endeavoured to stamp out, in the fanatical rage of persecution, the impressions which he had received since the appearance of John the Baptist, and the stings of conscience which he had perhaps experienced at the death of Stephen.

What I have given here is a study which, in the most favourable event, will serve to stir attention. They are reflections which, unsought, have been evolved from a topographic discussion on St. Paul's speech in the market-place ; and, reverting to what I started from, I can merely express my opinion, that whoever disputes the historical value of the account of St. Paul in Athens tears one of the most important pages from the history of the human race.

ERNST CURTIUS.

[For permission to translate this essay of the late Prof. Ernst Curtius I express my thanks to Frau Geheimrath Curtius and the publisher, Wilhelm Hertz (Besserche Buchhandlung).—A. E. N. SIMMS.]

*MISSIONARY METHODS IN THE TIMES OF THE
APOSTLES.*

I WOULD point out, as St. Paul's second rule in missionary work, that he always sought out the great centres of the world's intercourse, and exerted his whole strength in forming communities in these places, which, comparatively speaking, were few, but which in a short time were ready, not only to assert themselves, but also to spread the Christian faith in their neighbourhood. This rule touches the first in many points, inasmuch as the Jewish migration had also chiefly sought out these places. In the large and busy towns such as Antioch and Ephesus, Thessalonica and Corinth, and, still more, in Alexandria and Rome, the Jews formed a very considerable portion of the population. But apart from this St. Paul chose the large towns before all others as missionary stations. When, on his second missionary journey, he crossed the interior of Asia Minor, it seems to have been his intention to press on to the large towns on the west coast, to Ephesus and Smyrna, but the "Spirit forbad him." He then intended to take the road to Bithynia, and he seems to have had Nicomedia, and, further on, Byzantium, which were already important towns, in his mind, towns which were afterwards chosen by Diocletian and Constantine as the seats of their governments. Again the "Spirit suffered him not." When he arrived on the shores of Europe he did not go for a lengthy stay to Neapolis but to Philippi, the chief town of that part of Macedonia; neither to Apollonia, nor to Amphipolis, but to the larger commercial town of Thessalonica. He worked for a year and a half in Corinth, the chief political capital and the most important commercial town in the Greek province. He does not seem to have left Corinth during that period. St. Luke says he remained there

eighteen months. And yet we find that Christian communities existed in the next generation at Cenchrea, and in other places in the province.¹

He followed the same plan, and with the same success, at Ephesus, to which he now turned his steps. He devoted a period of three years to founding the Ephesian Church, if we count from the day he landed at Ephesus with Aquila and Priscilla.² During this period a number of communities were formed in the province of Asia,³ though they had not been visited by St. Paul. We learn this, not only from the account in the Acts of the Apostles, but also from the Epistle sent, some years later, by the Apostle from Rome to these districts. The communities in Colossæ, Hierapolis, and Loadicea, and the larger circle of Asiatic communities to which the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians was addressed, had not generally become acquainted with St. Paul, although individual Christians living there had previously met him. St. Paul was also content to found a local community here in a place of commanding position and to watch over it during its early development; but, in this way, a kind of provincial Church arose very quickly.

Even before his departure from Ephesus he had been looking out far beyond the borders of what had hitherto

¹ Rom. xvi. 1 (Acts xviii. 18); 2 Cor. i. 1, ix. 2. With reference to the later passages we must, it is true, remember that Athens also, where St. Paul had preached, and not quite fruitlessly (Acts xvii. 34), belonged to Achaia. Stephanus, who, from the time of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, took part with others in the intercourse between St. Paul and the Corinthians, was not a Corinthian by birth, but had undoubtedly been converted and baptized by St. Paul in Athens, for he and his family are called the "firstlings of Achaia" (1 Cor. xvi. 15). He had since then dwelt in Corinth, and had shortly before come to St. Paul at Corinth with the messengers of the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 17). St. Paul mentions him in such a casual manner (1 Cor. i. 16) that we can see St. Paul had really no need to mention him at all in an Epistle addressed to the local community of Corinth.

² Acts xviii. 19, xix. 1, 8, 10, 22, xx. 18, 31.

³ 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Acts xix. 10; Col. i. 4-7 f., ii. 1, iv. 13; Eph. i. 15, iii. 2.

been his sphere of work ; and it was again to a central point that he turned, indeed, the central point of the then civilized world. He wished first to visit the communities in Macedonia and Greece, and then to make a journey to Jerusalem ; and “ after,” said he, “ I must also see Rome.”¹ And when, six months later, he stopped in Macedonia on his way to Greece, he always kept this distant aim before him, even in the midst of the agitating transactions with the Corinthian community. It seemed to depend on the growth of faith in the Corinthians, that is, restoration, above all, of Church order there, whether he would be able to fulfil his intention of carrying the gospel farther west. His anxiety about the continuation of his work in Greece must have been relieved when, during a sojourn there of several months, he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. When announcing his approaching arrival in Rome, planned years before, but now near at hand, he speaks in strikingly modest terms of his intended missionary preaching in Rome. He, also, as a missionary, wished to have some fruit in Rome ; it ought not to seem as though the missionary who was elsewhere so eager for results, and who worked in a wider sphere than any other, were afraid to appear in Rome as a preacher where work was so difficult and dangerous. He did not, and, according to his principles, he could not, anticipate a long stay in Rome, for a thriving community existed there already, to his joy and the joy of all Christendom. St. Paul had always looked upon it as his especial mission to work only where he laid the foundation, and not to build upon that of another man. Thus Rome could only be a temporary abode for him, and it was in accordance with the method he had hitherto followed that he left the spread of the gospel in the neighbourhood of Rome and the whole

¹ Acts xix. 21 ; 2 Cor. x. 15 f. ; Rom. i. 8-16, xv. 22-32 ; Rom. xv. 20 ; 2 Cor. x. 15 (1 Cor. iii. 10).

of Italy to the Roman community and the other missionaries, and expressed his intention, on the other hand, of himself preaching in Spain.

St. Paul's persevering concentration of his whole strength on a few important points, whilst at the same time he was unweariedly pressing forward to the very borders of the then civilized world, gave such an impetus to his work that he was enabled to take that ideal view of the whole mission field which we might wish every missionary to have. If he had looked upon it as his mission to win as many individual souls as possible, no matter where, for the kingdom of God, he might have spent his life in Antioch, or in any province in the interior of Asia Minor. But then he could not in good faith have spoken with more truth of a Syrian or Lycaonian Church than he now spoke of Macedonia and Greece as Christianized lands.¹ Thus he could write to the Romans that he had preached the gospel from Jerusalem to the north-west frontier of Greece, round about Illyricum, and that he had fulfilled his task as a missionary in the lands through which he had wandered, so that there was no more room for an activity such as his in the lands surrounding the eastern half of the Mediterranean.² Thus it was granted to him, when certain death was before his

¹ 2 Cor. ix. 2; comp. Acts viii. 14; "Samaria had received the word of God."

² Rom. xv. 19, 23. It is very remarkable that he does not take Egypt and Alexandria into consideration here. The reasons must lie in facts of the history of missions, at which we can only guess. We do not know where Barnabas, who at the time of 1 Cor. ix. 6 was still travelling as a missionary, and Mark, after his dispute with St. Paul at Cyprus, betook themselves. Mark is considered by early tradition to have been the founder of the Alexandrian Church (Eus. *H. E.* ii. 16; *Theoph.* ed. Mai, *Nova Bibl.* iv. 121; and probably also by Theophilus in his lost historical work; also *Malalus*, x. cd. Bonn, p. 252; comp. my *Forschungen*, ii. 6, iii. 58). According to *Clem. Hom.* i. 9-14, Barnabas had also preached in Alexandria. The way from Antioch by Cyprus to Egypt was not unknown. Thoughts of Latin Africa raise similar questions, which we cannot well dismiss from our minds, with reference to 2 Tim. iv. 17 (see p. 463).

eyes, and he expected nothing more than a blessed departure and the crown of righteousness from the hand of a righteous Judge, to be able to look back upon the course of his ministry as complete, and to feel that he had reached the goal (2 Tim. iv. 6-8, 16-18). It had not all come to pass as he expected. He had not come to Rome as a missionary carrying out his own plans, but as a prisoner upon trial; and not for a stay that he could lengthen or shorten as he liked, according to the course that things might take, but for a stay of more than two years, during which he had not full control even over his own person. In spite of this his mission work there was most important. But he could not then have said immediately after it that he had finished his course. These words in his solemn testament would not have been the expression of a thankful idealism, but only a hollow phrase, if, as he had intended years before, St. Paul had not preached the gospel in far distant western lands beyond Rome; if he had not, before he departed out of this world, gone "to the very borders of the West," as is said of him by his younger contemporary, Clement of Rome. This is not the place to test the old traditions, with which we can only find fault for their meagreness, nor the assertions of modern critics so devoid of tradition which are set forth as historical facts. I will only express a hope that, in opposition to the subterfuges of even the newer exegetists most worthy of honour, the old ecclesiastical commentary will be maintained which found proof in 2 Timothy iv. 16, that St. Paul, after a lengthened imprisonment, was set at liberty again; that he again took up his course, which had been interrupted; and that this time he succeeded in reaching his goal. If this suggestion is right, we have here original testimony of the greatest weight, even should the second Epistle to Timothy prove to be an apocryphal writing of post-Apostolic times. It is nothing new which St. Paul

relates to Timothy when he reminds his friend at the end of this letter, so rich in reminiscences of former legal proceedings in which he was left in the lurch, that the Lord stood by him and strengthened him, so that he was saved from the lion's mouth—that is, from danger to life—from which there was apparently no escape. It seems to have been the Divine purpose that the missionary preaching should be brought to a conclusion by St. Paul himself, and not by other missionaries after him, and that all nations should hear it. It is certain, on the one hand, that St. Paul, as a religious man, would not ascribe to the Lord an intention that could neither be carried out in the future nor had been carried out up to the present; while, on the other hand, at the time he wrote, St. Paul no longer hoped for release and new earthly activity, but only for a blessed entrance into the “heavenly kingdom” of Jesus. Again, it is also quite as certain that in the interval he had seen this purpose of the Lord fulfilled. During that interval, after his first legal defence, St. Paul had carried the gospel far beyond the former boundaries; he had reached the goal that he had had in view for years—he had preached in Spain. Then and only then he could speak, as he did at the time he wrote the Epistle to the Romans, of his life's work in general, and of his task on the shores of the eastern half of the Mediterranean, as discharged. Here, as there, his language is enthusiastic. Had then *all* nations really accepted the preaching? And all from St. Paul? In order to look upon this mode of viewing things as natural, we must add the other historical allusions which are to be found in connexion with it.

Titus, who had long been St. Paul's valued coadjutor, had gone to Dalmatia, a certain Crescens, of whom we know nothing further, to Gaul, both surely for no other object than missionary work. Italy was cared for by the large

missionary community in Rome. St. Paul himself had visited Spain. Who knows if even then some grains of seed may not already have fallen on the fruitful soil of Egypt and of Latin Africa? But the little that we do know explains to us the last words that have come down to us from the great converter of nations.

In the last remarks we may find at least one answer to the question as to the means by which St. Paul obtained these results, results which must always remain marvellously great, even when we translate the language of thankful joy for work done into the prose of statistics. One means was the power St. Paul possessed from the very first of drawing helpers to his side, and training them for their common work. On the first missionary journey we see St. Paul and Barnabas going out together as equals to their missionary work, just as Jesus had sent out the Twelve and the Seventy, two and two.

If St. Barnabas appeared at first to stand in the forefront as one who had long been held in high esteem in Christendom, and who was also the highly honoured teacher of St. Paul himself, and probably also on account of his more imposing personal appearance,¹ these relations were soon reversed, when St. Paul, as the more fiery and eloquent orator, was the chief spokesman. The third, John Mark, who joined himself to them, but who, already before they crossed from Cyprus to Asia Minor, had separated from them again in order to return to his mother at Jerusalem, is

¹ This we may conclude from Acts xiv. 12, in comparison with 2 Cor. x. 10, Gal. iv. 14; comp. also *Acta Theclæ*, c. 3, and also my *Gesch. d. Kanons*, ii. 903 f. Barnabas is placed first in Acts xiii. 2-7, and for the reasons just mentioned (because Zeus was named before Hermes), and also in xiv. 12-14. St. Paul, on the other hand, is placed first in Acts xiii. 43, 46, 50; xv. 2, 12, 22, 35. That Barnabas is mentioned before St. Paul, xv. 25, in the letter of the Apostles and Elders of Jerusalem is explained by the fact that he was more closely connected with the writers of the letter.

described as their minister or fellow-labourer.¹ The context of the passage in which we read this shows that a servant is not referred to, who carried the missionaries' baggage, but rather a helper in preaching. When St. Paul, after a long estrangement, came across St. Mark again in Rome, the latter {worked quite independently as a missionary, but yet in co-operation with him. In his last Epistle St. Paul begs St. Timothy to bring St. Mark, who had in the meantime been in the East, to Rome with him, because he was very profitable to him for the ministry. This cannot refer to the outward service and care of the imprisoned Apostle. When necessary this would naturally have been undertaken by the members of the inner circle, the physician St. Luke, who had not forsaken the Apostle, and Timothy himself when he came to Rome. It was rather for mission work that a man like Mark appeared of such incalculable worth to St. Paul. Important missionary interests were at stake when St. Paul and Barnabas contended so sharply as to whether they should take Mark with them on their second missionary journey, after he had shown a want of courage on the first, that they parted asunder the one from the other for good. We can gather to some extent in what sense a man like Mark would be of importance to St. Paul, from his choice of a companion when he separated from Barnabas and Mark. Silas, or Silvanus,² whom he then prevailed on to accompany him, had formerly been a leading figure in the community at Jerusalem. He had also been sent with Judas Barsabas as an ambassador from the mother community to carry the decisions of the Apostles' College to Antioch, and had expounded the thoughts out of which

¹ Acts xiii. 5 (comp. xii. 12, 25), xiii. 13, xv. 37-39; Col. iv. 10; Philemon 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11; 1 Peter v. 13; comp. Klostermann, *Das Markus-evangelium*, p. 338.

² Acts xv. 22, 32, 40.—2 Cor. i. 19, with the Epistles to the Thessalonians, is especially important with reference to his later position.

these decisions had grown by word of mouth with zeal and success. He was therefore well acquainted with the course which had been taken by missions to the Gentiles under the guidance of St. Paul. This was an indispensable qualification for the coadjutor of St. Paul in this sphere, but not the real reason why St. Paul chose him as his helper. It is much more probable that the same considerations weighed with him now which had caused him to value Mark. Though certain of his own faith and of his call, yet St. Paul could not conceal from himself his deficiency in that he had not been Jesus' disciple, neither had he spent any length of time at the source of evangelical tradition. Now missionary preaching without lively narratives of the words and deeds of Jesus would have been a monstrosity. We should form a very peculiar idea of St. Paul as a missionary, and still more of his willing listeners, if we were to suppose that he obtained success by means of a "gospel" without an abundance of historical details. We learn from the few passages in his Epistles in which he refers back to his fundamental teaching, that very many historical events, some of them only by this means incidentally made known to us by him, were contained in his missionary sermons.¹ This is only confirmed by the Acts of the Apostles. We must not indeed take addresses such as those at Lystra and on the Areopagus at Athens as examples, for both of these were utterances called forth by special events which had preceded the missionary sermons.² The only sermon which pictures to us his missionary addresses was that preached in the synagogue in Antioch of Pisidia; but this is also in great measure an outline of gospel history, and all that we possess of it in Acts xiii. 16-41 is of course only a

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 1-8, xi. 23-25; comp. 1 Tim. vi. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 8.

² Acts xiv. 15-17; comp. with v. 7-9; Acts xvii. 22-31; comp. with v. 17 f.

sketch which in reality corresponded to an amplification that was much more rich in form and colour. Further, the manner in which St. Paul reminds the newly formed communities of single sayings of Jesus,¹ or requires that the word of Christ should dwell in them richly (Col. iii. 16 ; 1 Tim. vi. 3), and the manner in which he insists on the identity of his gospel, that is of his missionary preaching, with the preaching of Jesus, or the testimony, words, and gospel of Christ,² presupposes, not only that he set great value on evangelistic tradition himself, but that also it was imparted in large measure in the earliest preaching. It was therefore important that St. Paul should be accompanied by men like Silas and Barnabas, who had from their earliest days belonged to the community in Jerusalem, the original source of Evangelical tradition, or else by a young man like Mark, who, as the son of an old Christian family in Jerusalem, had grown up well acquainted with the narratives of Jesus' disciples. They could confirm and complete by vivid accounts of the "Lord Jesus," the witness of St. Paul, who when he stood forth alone, would scarcely be able, as at first in Corinth, to preach anything but the great fundamental fact of "Christ crucified." And they must have acted thus if the condition of Christendom in the communities of St. Paul is to be clearly understood.

Other helpers, whom St. Paul had first converted and then had attached to himself in common work, served him in other ways. In the rapid progress of the Pauline mission, which was oftentimes brought about by external pressure, it was a difficult task, and one that demanded ever more and more strength, to maintain the continuous growth of Christian life in the scarcely formed communities in a right

¹ 1 Thess. iv. 15, v. 2 ; ¹ 1 Cor. vii. 10 (12, 25), ix. 14, xi. 23 ff. ; Acts xx. 35.

² For instance, Rom. xvi. 25, iv. 17 ; 1 Cor. i. 6 ; Gal. i. 7 ; 2 Thess. i. 8.

direction, and to preserve unweakened over them the influence of the founder of the community. This "care of all the Churches," for which we are chiefly indebted to the Epistles of St. Paul which have come down to us, must have often suggested to him the vain wish that he could be at the same time in two different places.¹ It would have weighed down the lonely Apostle, in spite of all his gifts, and have confined his work within very narrow limits had he not known how to attach helpers to himself who yearly increased in numbers. When he was driven out of Macedonia, he went first to Greece, and left Silas and Timothy behind for a time to continue the interrupted work in Berea. Full of anxiety on account of the community at Thessalonica, he sent Timothy back there from Athens. He arrived in Corinth without these two helpers, and while they were occupied in strengthening the youthful communities which had been so lately formed, he was engaged in laying by himself the foundations of a new one at Corinth. When St. Paul was only able to make a short stay in Crete at a later period, he left Titus there in order to organize more fully the community that had just been founded.

What a vivid picture St. Paul's Epistles give us of the constant movement and manifold employments of his fellow-workers! How many of the Apostle's letters, which we no longer possess, must have been carried in their wallets by those friends of whose journeys hither and thither we hear! and how many commissions, of which we possess no information, must have been carried personally and by word of mouth by the bearers of the letters we do possess!

There were also tasks which lasted longer, and which St. Paul could not intrust to the native powers of the local communities, but which he made over to his missionary helpers. Timothy had been a missionary from the time

¹ Gal. iv. 20; 1 Thess. ii. 19; 1 Cor. v. 3 f.; comp. 2 Cor. xi. 28 f.

that St. Paul chose him as his companion, and the presbytery of the community in his native place, following prophetic voices, had set him apart by the laying on of hands.¹ He was one of the missionaries of Macedonia and Greece, and it is with reference to this his calling that St. Paul finally urges him to do the work of an Evangelist² unweariedly, for to "preach the gospel" does not mean anywhere in the New Testament training the community in the rudiments of the faith, but the declaration of salvation in Christ Jesus to those who do not know of it, or, at all events, do not as yet believe in it. But it also appears as an outcome of his evangelistic or missionary work that Timothy, when St. Paul wrote his first Epistle to him, had been working as a teacher for some time, at his desire, in the community at Ephesus, which had long been founded, and watching over all the regulations for the life of the community at the same time.

St. Paul also allowed the helpers who were under his influence to do independent missionary work where the foundations had yet to be laid. The Colossian Epaphras is represented to us throughout as the founder of the Ephesian community, perhaps also of the neighbouring communities of Laodicea and Hierapolis.³ Crescens and Titus must

¹ Acts xvi. 1-4; 1 Tim. iv. 14; comp. i. 18; 2 Tim. i. 6; 1 Thess. i. 1-6, iii. 2; 2 Cor. i. 19.

² 2 Tim. iv. 5; comp. i. 8. It seems natural, that the missionaries, who no longer wandered from place to place, but had become more or less settled, were called "Evangelists" (Acts xxi. 8; Eph. iv. 11) rather than "Apostles," for the idea of an itinerant preacher clung to the latter word in its wider application beyond the circle of those to whom Christ Himself had given it as an inalienable title. When it became the custom to call the writers of the Gospels Evangelists, "Evangelists" or "Apostles," in the sense of the New Testament, with reference to the doctrine of the Apostles scarcely existed. Comp., however, Eus. *H. E.* iii. 37, the heading and the text, as a proof that an "Evangelist" = missionary.

³ Col. i. 7, iv. 12; Philemon 23.

have been the first missionaries to set foot in Dalmatia and Gaul. But wherever these helpers of St. Paul founded communities they established a spiritual connexion between the new converts and the great leader in the missionary field.¹ St. Paul loved to describe his helpers as fellow-soldiers, his comrades in the service of Christ. They must have looked up to him as their general, whose plans and directions they need only conscientiously carry out in order to please their Commander-in-chief and heavenly King. To the Apostle himself, and to us also, the results of the work of his scholars appear as a portion of his own life's work. He owed his great success not least to his power of allowing himself to be presented and supported, not only by individuals, but also by communities.

He was not satisfied with often urging on his communities the duty of making a favourable impression as to the moral character of Christendom on their heathen surroundings by a conversation worthy of the gospel, and of thus destroying their adverse prejudices. He also claimed, to a great extent, the material support of the communities. It is true that he renounced² all claim to the right of an Evangelist, though in itself he fully acknowledged it, to receive his livelihood in return for the work of his calling, that is, according to the directions of Jesus, to allow himself to be supported by the willing hearers of the gospel. He provided for his own support, as we know, by working at a loom with his own hands. As, on one occasion, he unites Barnabas with himself in this respect, we may conclude that he and his companions carried out this plan on the first missionary journey. It was certainly not a precautionary measure that was unnecessary. Had he acted otherwise, the evil repute of greed that hung over the Jews might easily have

¹ Col. i. 8, ii. 5, iv. 7 f.; Eph. i. 15 f., iii. 1 f., vi. 21 f.

² Phil. ii. 25-30, iv. 10-20; comp. 1 Tim. i. 16 f.

cast a deep shadow over the whole work of missions to the Gentiles. St. Paul was especially careful to carry out his principle of preaching the gospel without cost in commercial towns like Corinth. It was not till he was imprisoned that he was obliged to allow his friends at a distance to alleviate his outward circumstances by gifts of money and other proofs of love.¹ But missions cost money then, as much as they do now, irrespective of the missionaries' daily bread. St. Paul's long and constant journeys in themselves required funds, which St. Paul could neither supply himself by the work of his hands, nor demand of communities which were scarcely formed.² But yet they very early recognized it as their duty to support the Apostle in this respect. From the very first the community at Philippi participated in missionary work by constant gifts of money.³

Those collections for the good of the impoverished Christians in Jerusalem and Palestine, which St. Paul gathered so zealously in the whole circle of the Gentile-Christian communities, stood in close connexion with missions.⁴ It was not only a question of fulfilling the duty of showing loving-kindness to suffering and needy brethren ; it was still more important to prove to the Jewish Christians by act, that in the communities under the commanding influence of the Apostle to the Gentiles love and gratitude for the mother community were fostered, as well as a warm sense of fraternity. It was also necessary to show that they on their part were ready to return good for evil. It was not only the blessing of the gospel which had been sent out from Palestine into

¹ Possibly also the hire of the place of assembly (Acts xix. 9).

² 1 Cor. ix. 4-18 ; 2 Cor. xi. 7-12, xii. 14-18 ; Thess. ii. 9 ; 2 Thess. iii. 8 ; Acts xviii. 3, xx. 34.

³ Phil. i. 3 ff., iv. 15 f. (comp. my *Abhandlung in der Zeitschr. für kirchl. Wiss.* 1885, pp. 1-4 ff.) ; 2 Cor. xi. 8 f.

⁴ Gal. ii. 10 ; 1 Cor. xvi. 1-4 (15 f.) ; 2 Cor. viii. and ix. ; Rom. xv. 25-28 ; Acts xi. 29 f., xxiv. 17.

Gentile lands, Palestine was also the home of those Judaizing missionaries who followed everywhere at the Apostle's heels and were always raising, chiefly behind his back, the most odious difficulties. St. Paul could not have replied to this hostility in a nobler manner, or in one more easily understood by the community, than when, accompanied by deputies from the Greek, Macedonian, and Asiatic communities, he brought the large proceeds of the collections which had been made for a long time past to Jerusalem. As at a former time, ignoring the Judaizers, he had resolved, not without some self-sacrifice, to assure himself of the approval of the authorities in Jerusalem, so now he was careful to protect himself in the rear by all permissible methods when he thought of turning from the East to the West. Again, the letter written some months earlier to the Romans did much to smother the seeds of distrust in him and his work, which had been sown broadcast by the Jewish Christians, and thus to clear out of the way a serious hindrance to the successful progress of the mission. The Apostle was in large measure successful. Although, as we have seen, he had to complain in Rome of the disturbing rivalry of the Jewish missionaries, he nevertheless worked with such great success, and made such an abiding impression on the community which he found in existence there, that he has lived on in their remembrance as one of their leading founders—St. Paul beside St. Peter.

Christians from Palestine who appealed to St. James or St. Peter had in early days striven everywhere to stop the way of the Apostle to the Gentiles. St. Peter himself, probably at a considerably earlier date, had once appeared at Antioch, and had called down on himself a sharp rebuke from St. Paul. Probably their real agreement was accelerated rather than retarded thereby. But how differently circumstances were now shaping themselves as the days of

St. Paul were drawing to a close ! Mark, St. Peter's spiritual son and the cousin of Barnabas, who had once been declared by St. Paul unfit for missionary service, now gave him unclouded joy. He longed to have him with him. If St. Peter did come to Rome and write his first Epistle there, we may conclude that St. Peter felt that the hour had come to enter the wide regions, in which St. Paul had broken up the ground, with his own work, and thus to confirm the work of St. Paul. Silas St. Paul's former companion, was the mediator between St. Peter at Rome and the Gentile Christians in Asia Minor. Soon after we see the other leaders of the Palestinian Church beginning to labour in the Church of Asia Minor—St. John at Ephesus, St. Philip in Hierapolis, and others also who have left fewer certain traces of their work in those regions. During the tumult of war which raged in Palestine both before and after the year 70 A.D., the gospel was silenced, and those who had preached it there were set free for a wider field of labour. That those who could say, "That which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked on, and our hands have handled . . . that declare we unto you," should settle in Asia Minor and elsewhere was certainly an incalculable gain, above all to the Christians living there who loved Jesus, though they had not seen Him ; but it must also have given an impetus to the advancement of missionary work in those regions. The existing communities were still candlesticks which allowed the light of Christian experience to shine in their Gentile and Jewish surroundings.¹ In the Revelation the Lord uses words to the community in Philadelphia which would almost seem more suitable for an individual missionary. "See, I have set before thee an open door."² New communities also came into existence—one, for instance, at

¹ Rev. i. 20, ii. 1-5 ff. ; comp. Phil. ii. 15 f.

² Rev. iii. 8 ; comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 8 ; 2 Cor. ii. 12 ; Col. iv. 3.

Smyrna—where, according to the testimony, rightly understood, of their Bishop Polycarp, there had been none in St. Paul's time, though one did exist at the time of the Revelation.¹ According to a good old tradition, the Apostle St. John used to make journeys from Ephesus, when very old, to the surrounding districts, visiting heathen villages and organizing new communities.² There were also some amongst his scholars who went from place to place seeking to bring the gospel unto the heathen, and, where Christians lived, claiming their hospitality, and thus giving them the opportunity of being fellow-workers in the truth. (3 John 8.) We must conclude from the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* that this privilege was sometimes misused.³ The communities were to beware of vagrants who wished to be thought Apostles. Not a single great missionary's name shines out upon us from that gloomy time. We shall be right in concluding that the times of the Apostles—that is of the great missionaries—closed with the death of St. John.

It cannot have been much later that the Roman Christian Hermas, the author of *The Shepherd*, pictured to himself the growth of the Church thus far in a vision, under the form of a gigantic tower. This tower was founded on the Rock, the Eternal Son of God, who had appeared at the end of the times. In as far as it had attained to completion it had been built by forty Apostles and teachers, who had been called away from the earthly building place. Then there was a pause; further building was deferred. The building had not yet been completed, but it would be completed, and then the Lord would come. It was thus that a simple Christian, on the border line of the first and second centuries, viewed the state of missions at that period, and

¹ Rev. ii. 8; *Polyc. ad Phil.* 11; comp. my *Forschungen*, iv. 253-259.

² Clemens Alex., *Quis dives salvus*, § 42.

³ c. 11, and, in addition, my *Forschungen*, iii. 299.

thus that he believed in their completion. May God preserve us in this faith at a time which, in comparison with the times of the Apostle, may seem insignificant and poor in strength and in gifts, but which, nevertheless, does not deserve to be called a time in which missionary work is at a standstill.

THEOD. ZAHN.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE BOOK OF
ECCLESIASTICUS.

vii. 15. *Hate not laborious work, neither husbandry, which the Most High hath ordained.*

The Spirit testifies [says St. Patrick in his *Confession* (ch. i.)], "and husbandry was ordained by the Most High." Therefore I, first a rustic, then a fugitive, unlearned indeed, unknowing how to provide for the future—but I know this most certainly, that before I was humbled I was like a stone lying in deep mud; and He who is mighty came and in His own mercy raised me up and placed me on the top of the wall.

vii. 23–24. *Hast thou children? instruct them, and bow down their neck from their youth. Hast thou daughters? have a care of their body, and shew not thyself cheerful toward them.*

The discipline of the family, in those days, was of a far more rigid kind than now. The frown, the harsh rebuke, the frequent application of the rod, enjoined by Scriptural authority, were used, not merely in the way of punishment for actual offences, but as a wholesome regimen for the growth and promotion of all childish virtues.—HAWTHORNE: *The Scarlet Letter* (ch. vi.).

viii. 9. *Miss not the discourse of the aged; for they also learned of their fathers.*

We cannot but lament [says Lowell in *My Study Windows*] that Mr. Quincy did not earlier begin to keep a diary. "Miss not the discourses of the elders," though now put in the Apocrypha, is a wise precept, but incomplete unless we add, "Nor cease from

recording whatsoever thing thou hast gathered therefrom"—so ready is oblivion with her fatal shears.

viii. 19. *Open not thine heart to every man.*

Lay not thine heart open to every man, but plead thy cause with the wise and such as fear God. Be not much with young people and with strangers.—THOMAS À KEMPIS, *Imitatio* (i. 8).

ix. 1. *Be not jealous over the wife of thy bosom, and teach her not an evil lesson against thyself.*

Jealousy [observes Addison in the *Spectator* (170)] puts a woman often in mind of an ill thing that she would not otherwise perhaps have thought of, and fills her imagination with such an unlucky idea, as in time grows familiar, excites desire, and loses all the shame and terror which might at first attend it. Nor is it a wonder if she who suffers wrongfully in a man's opinion of her, and has therefore nothing to forfeit in his esteem, resolves to give him reason for his suspicions, and to enjoy the pleasure of the crime, since she must undergo the ignominy. Such probably were the considerations that directed the wise man in his advice to husbands : *be not jealous over the wife of thy bosom, and teach her not an evil lesson against thyself.*

What shall a man do now in such a case ? What remedy is to be had ? How shall he be eased ? . . . Make a virtue of necessity, and conceal it. Yea, but the world takes notice of it, 'tis in every man's mouth : let them talk their pleasure, of whom speak they not in this sense ? From the highest to the lowest, they are thus censured all : there is no remedy there but patience. It may be 'tis his own fault, and he hath no reason to complain, 'tis *quid pro quo*, she is bad, he is worse. . . . And therefore, as well adviseth Sirciacides, *cap. 9. 1, teach her not an evil lesson against thyself*, which as Jansenius, Lyranus, on this text, and Carthusianus interpret, is no otherwise to be understood, than that she do thee not a mischief. I do not excuse her in accusing thee ; but if both be naught, mend thyself first ; for as the old saying is, a good husband makes a good wife.—BURTON, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, part iii. sect. 3.

ix. 10. *Forsake not an old friend ; for the new is not comparable to him : as new wine so is a new friend ; if it become old, thou shalt drink it with gladness.*

There is another saying in the same author which would have been very much admired in an heathen writer : *forsake not an old friend, for the new is not comparable to him : a new friend is as new*

wine ; when it is old thou shalt drink it with pleasure. With what strength of allusion and force of thought has he described the breaches and violations of friendship ? *Whoso casteth a stone at the birds frayeth them away ; and he that upbraideth his friend, breaketh friendship. Tho' thou drawest a sword at a friend, yet despair not, for there may be a returning to favour. If thou hast opened thy mouth against thy friend, fear not, for there may be a reconciliation ; except for upbraiding or pride or disclosing of secrets or a treacherous wound ; for, for these things every friend will depart* (ix. 20 f.).—ADDISON, in the *Spectator* (68).

x. 15. *The Lord hath plucked up the roots of the proud nations, and planted the lowly in their place.*

Where I see the greatest difficulty [Fénelon writes to the Marquis de Seignelai] is neither in your sharpness with your servants nor your vehemence against those who cross you ; what I fear most is your natural haughtiness, and your violent inclination for pleasure. I dread your pride, because you cannot give yourself to God, and be filled with His Spirit, unless you are emptied of self, and despise it heartily. God is jealous of His own glory, and that of men offends Him. “He resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble,” and “The Lord hath plucked up the roots of the proud nations and planted the lowly in their place.” He will never give you His blessing unless you are lowly in His sight, unless you renounce worldly glory.

x. 28. *My son, glorify thy soul in meekness, and give it honour according to the dignity thereof.*

Real humility [observes Sir Henry Taylor in *Notes upon Life* (p. 50)] will not teach us any undue severity, but *truthfulness* in self-judgment. “My son, glorify thy soul in meekness, and give it honour according to the dignity thereof.” For undue self-abasement and self-distrust will impair the strength and independence of the mind, which, if accustomed to have a just satisfaction with itself when it may, will the better bear to probe itself, and will lay itself open with the more fortitude to intimations of its weakness on points in which it stands truly in need of correction. No humility is thoroughly sound which is not thoroughly truthful. The man who brings misdirected or inflated accusations against himself, does so in a false humility, and will probably be found to indemnify himself on one side or another.

xi. 2, 4. *Commend not a man for his beauty ; and abhor not a man for his outward appearance. Glory not in the*

putting on of raiment, and exalt not thyself in the day of honour.

There is nothing solid or valiant to be hoped for from such as are always kempt and perfumed, and every day smell of the tailor. . . . If we will look with our understanding, and not our senses, we may behold virtue and beauty (though covered with rags) in their brightness; and vice and deformity so much the fouler, in having all the splendour of riches to gild them, or the false light of honour and power to help them. Yet this is that wherewith the world is taken, and runs mad to gaze on—clothes and titles, the birdlime of fools.—Jonson: *Discoveries* (cii.).

xi. 5-6. *Many kings have sat upon the ground; and one that was never thought of hath worn the crown. Many mighty men have been greatly disgraced; and the honourable delivered into other men's hands.*

Compare the conversation, in the fifteenth chapter of *The Bride of Lammermoor*, between Sir William Ashton and the political agent.

“It is possible [said the latter] that, in the next session of Parliament, young Ravenswood may find more friends and favour even than your lordship.” “That would be a sight worth seeing,” said the Keeper, scornfully. “And yet,” said his friend, “such things have been seen ere now, and in our own time. There are many at the head of affairs even now, that a few years ago were under hiding for their lives; and many a man now dines on plate of silver, that was fain to eat his crowdy without a bicker; and many a high head has been brought full low amongst us in as short a space. Scott of Scotstarvet’s ‘Staggering State of Scots Statesmen,’ of which curious memoir you showed me a manuscript, has been outstaggered in our time.”

xi. 28. *Call no man blessed before his death.*

In time, no doubt [says Schopenhauer] justice will be done every one; *tempo e galant' uomo*. But this justice is as tardy in arriving as that of a law-court, and the secret condition is that the recipient shall no longer be alive. The precept of Jesus the son of Sirach is faithfully followed: *judge none blessed before his death.*

xii. 1, 7. *If thou doest good, know to whom thou doest it. . . . Give to the good man, and help not the sinner.*

In Macaulay's diary (Oct. 14, 1850) the following entry occurs :—

In the morning —— called. He seems to be getting on well. He is almost the only person to whom I ever gave liberal assistance without having reason to regret it. Of course, I do not speak of my own family ; but I am confident that, within the last ten years, I have laid out several hundreds of pounds in trying to benefit people whose own vices and follies have frustrated every attempt to serve them.

xii. 13–14. *Who will pity a charmer that is bitten with a serpent, or any that come nigh wild beasts? Even so, who will pity him that goeth to a sinner and is mingled with him in his sins?*

Be critical in thy consortion [says Sir Thomas Browne in his *Christian Morals*]. Look not for roses in 'ttalus' garden, or wholesome flowers in a venomous plantation. And since there is scarce any one bad, but some are the worse for him, tempt not contagion by proximity, and hazard not thyself in the shadow of corruption.

xii. 16. *An enemy speaketh sweetly with his lips, but in his heart he imagineth how to throw thee into a pit.*

Compare. first scene of the first act in *Cymbeline*, where the queen cunningly pretends to help the lovers :—

I'll fetch a turn about the garden, pitying
The pangs of barred affections, though the king
Hath charged you should not speak together.

Imogen. O

Dissembling courtesy ! How fine this tyrant
Can tickle where she wounds ! . . .

Queen (re-entering). Be brief, I pray you :
If the king come, I shall incur I know not
How much of his displeasure. [*Aside*] Yet I'll move him
To walk this way.

xiii. 23. *A rich man speaketh, and all keep silence ; and what he saith they extol to the clouds.*

Compare Henry Smith's reflection, in *The Fair Maid of Perth*, after Sir Patrick Charteris has delivered his oracular and stately consolations :—

“The Provost,” he said bitterly to himself, “is an excellent man ; marry, he holds his knighthood so high, that if he speaks nonsense, a poor man must hold it sense, as he must praise dead ale if it be handed to him in his lordship’s silver flagon.”

xiv. 18–19. *As of the green leaves on a thick tree, some fall, and some grow ; so of the generations of flesh and blood, one cometh to an end, and another is born. Every work rotteth and consumeth away, and the worker thereof shall depart with it.*

Compare the reminiscence of this passage in *Old Mortality* :—

“Let the tide of the world wax or wane as it will,” Morton thought, as he looked around him, “enough will be found to fill the place which chance renders vacant ; and, in the usual occupations and amusements of life, human beings will succeed each other, as leaves upon the same tree, with the same individual difference, and the same general resemblance.

xv. 14–17. *He himself made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his own counsel. If thou wilt, thou shalt keep the commandments ; and to perform faithfulness is of thine own good pleasure. He hath set fire and water before thee : thou shalt stretch out thine hand unto whichsoever thou wilt. Before man is life and death ; and whichsoever he liketh, it shall be given him.*

When referred to this passage, asserting man’s freedom of will, Calvin (*Institutes*, ch. v. of the second book) replies :—

To my opponents, and to the author of *Ecclesiasticus*, whoever he was, my answer is this :—If you mean to tell man that in himself there is a power of acquiring salvation, your authority with us is not as great as, in the least degree, to prejudice the undoubted word of God ; but if only wishing to curb the malignity of the flesh, which, by transferring the blame of its own wickedness to God, is wont to catch at a vain defence, you say, that rectitude was given to man, in order to make it apparent that he was the cause of his own destruction, I willingly agree. Only do you agree with me in this, that it is by man’s own fault he is stripped of the ornaments in which the Lord at first attired him, and then let us

unite in acknowledging that what he now wants is not a defender but a physician.

xv. 17. *Before man is life and death ; and whether him liketh shall be given him.*

The righteous government of the world must be carried on ; and, of necessity, men shall remain the subjects of it, by being examples of its mercy or of its justice. *Life and death are set before them, and whether they like shall be given unto them.* They are to make their choice, and abide by it ; but which soever their choice be, the gospel is equally a witness to them ; and the purposes of Providence are answered by this witness of the gospel.—BUTLER, *Sermons*.

xv. 20. *He hath commanded no man to do wickedly, neither hath he given any man licence to sin.*

We must beware [says Augustine in his *Enchiridion* (section lxx.)] lest any one should imagine that gross sins, such as those committed by people who shall not inherit the Kingdom of God, may be daily perpetrated, and daily atoned for by almsgiving. The life must be changed for the better ; and almsgiving must be asked to propitiate God for past sins, and not to win impunity for the commission of such sins in future. For God has given no man licence to sin, though in His mercy He may blot out sins already committed, if we do not neglect to make proper satisfaction.

xvi. 17–18. *Say not thou, I shall be hidden from the Lord ; and who shall remember me from on high ? I shall not be known among so many people ; for what is my soul in a boundless creation ?*

The tragedy of the individual life reaching its climax seems, to the chief actor, worthy to claim and hold universal attention. Yet the sun never stands still in heaven, nor do the footsteps of men tarry upon earth. No one person may take up too much space, too much time. The movement of things is not stayed. The single cry, however bitter, is drowned in the roar of the pushing crowd.—Lucas Malet in *Sir Richard Colmady* (bk. iii.).

xvii. 31. *What is brighter than the sun ? Yet this faileth.*

O thou that rollest above, round as the shield of my fathers ! Whence are thy beams, O sun ! thy everlasting light ? . . . But thou art, perhaps, like we, for a season, thy years will have an end.

Thou shalt sleep in thy clouds careless of the voice of the morning.
—*Ossian* : “ Carthon.”

xviii. 1. *He that liveth for ever created all things in common.*

The Vulgate translation of *in common* by *simul* (= “together”) led Anselm, in his *Cur Deus Homo* (xviii.) to argue in favour of the simultaneous creation of men and angels.

xviii. 13. *The mercy of a man is upon his neighbour ; but the mercy of the Lord is upon all flesh ; reproving, chastening, and teaching, and bringing again, as a shepherd doth his flock.*

In the Greek and pre-Maccabean period the tendency undoubtedly existed to make God’s providence co-extensive with humanity. Even Sirach, who on the whole is strongly nationalist, can say : “ The lovingkindness of man is towards his neighbour : the lovingkindness of God is towards all flesh.” The universal charity of God is the moral of Jorah.—MONTEFIORE : *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 443.

xviii. 25–26. *When thou hast enough, remember the time of hunger ; and when thou art rich, think upon poverty and need. From the morning until the evening the time is changed, and all things are soon done before the Lord.*

We cannot expect [Keats writes] to give way many hours to pleasure. Circumstances are like clouds continually gathering and bursting. While we are laughing, the seed of some trouble is put into the wide arable land of events ; while we are laughing it sprouts, it grows, and suddenly bears a poison fruit which we must pluck.

xviii. 30. *Go not after thy lusts, but refrain thyself from thine appetites.*

A drunkard I never was, but I have known drunkards made sober by Thee. From Thee then it was that they who never were such, should not so be, as from Thee it was that they should not always continue to be such, who have been such. I heard also another voice of Thine, “ Go not after thy lusts, but refrain thyself from thine appetites.”—AUGUSTINE : *Confessions*, book x. chap. 31.

JAMES MOFFATT.

THE NEW POPYRI OF ELEPHANTINE.

To all who are interested in the story of the Old Testament, the discoveries at Elephantine offer a wonderful prospect—that of seeing a history of Israel at some time based upon authentic and contemporary records. For between even the brilliant conjectures on which the work of Wellhausen is based and certain knowledge there is a wide gulf. The hope of obtaining such records from Palestine, though not quite extinct, is exceedingly faint: nothing but stone or brick would be preserved in that soil, and documents engraved on these materials have hitherto been yielded by it in scanty numbers. From Egypt, where papyrus is preserved by the soil, till recently little illustrative of Israelitish history earlier than Alexandrian Judaism was ever expected. But the unexpected has once more come about. The Jewish colony of Upper Egypt, of which the Bible knows little more than the name, has suddenly come into prominence. The deed-box of a family belonging to it in the Persian period was accidentally discovered, and threw a powerful light on some of the prophecies incorporated in the Book of Jeremiah. A second find, of which the firstfruits have now been published, takes us far nearer to the communities of Palestine of whom some records have come down to us in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. We can scarcely believe that this source will have run dry before it has furnished material which will set at rest a number of burning controversies. If the Jewish communities of Egypt in the year 400 B.C.

had any Sacred Books, and portions of them or the whole of them should come to light, what will their relation turn out to be to the sacred canon of later Jews and Christians? How far will their Torah—should it be discovered—coincide with any of the documents which criticism has endeavoured to reconstruct? Had they any portion of our Isaiah or of our Psalms? For some years, at any rate, the eyes of Biblical students will be directed towards Upper Egypt, as the probable source of enlightenment on these and similar problems.

The second find, published by Dr. E. Sachau in the *Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* for the year 1907, consists of a complete papyrus, dated from the 17th year of Darius, and containing a letter addressed by the Jews of Elephantine to the governor of Jehûd (the Jews): a fragmentary copy of the same letter, in slightly different wording: and a fragmentary reply from two of the persons mentioned as addressees in the first papyrus. Dr. Sachau's translation and commentaries will of course be the basis for any future studies of these documents.

It is noticeable that the complete papyrus (the only one of the three to be dealt with in this article) contains numerous mistakes, some of which are corrected by the scribe himself between the lines, whereas others are left uncorrected, though the fragmentary copy affords the means of correcting some. Perhaps then the reason why the papyrus is preserved lies in the fact that it was never sent: either it was used by some official copyist or translator as a draft whence to make the copy to be sent to the governor in Palestine; and such a document would be likely to be free from clerical errors, and to be couched in Persian. Or it may be a duplicate of the copy actually sent, retained for purposes of reference, as is the custom in modern times, and as was usual afterwards at the bureaux of the Caliphs.

The language is, according to Dr. Sachau, the very purest Aramaic: this does not prevent it being in many places ungrammatical, and hard to translate with certainty. It contains what appear to be decided Hebraisms, and in general bears an extraordinary likeness to the language of Nehemiah. This appears both in the phraseology and the tone.

TRANSLATION.

To our Master Bagoas,¹ governor of the Jews. Thy servants Jedoniah and associates, priests in the city of Elephantine.

May the God of Heaven² pray for the peace³ of our Master much at all times, and appoint thee to mercy⁴ before king Dariohos and them of his household⁵ a thousand times more than now⁶: and may he give thee long life. And be thou joyous⁷ and strong at all times.

Now thy servant Jedoniah and his associates say thus: In the month Tammuz, of the year 14 of Dariohos the king, when Arsames⁸ had gone away and gone to the king,

¹ Bagoas: Aram. בַּגּוּאֵי. A name apparently derived from old Pers. Baga or Bâga, "God."

² The God of heaven: Neh. i. 4, 5.

³ The phrase in the text יִשְׁאַל שְׁלָם is common in Hebrew and Aramaic for "to greet." At first sight there would seem to be an extraordinary parallel to this phrase in the Arabic formula used after the names of Prophets: *ṣallâ 'llâhu 'alaihi wasallama*, "may God pray over him and salute him!" Yet it seems more probable that the word יִשְׁאַל, "ask, is a miswriting for some word meaning "increase."

⁴ The phrase is common in the O.T. with the verb נָתַן for שִׁי of the text.

⁵ According to Diodorus the famous Bagoas had a friend in the grandson of Ostanes, brother of Artaxerxes II.

⁶ A thousand times, etc.: in the passages quoted below from Diodorus the great Bagoas is repeatedly described as the most trusted of the king's friends.

⁷ The Greek formulae *χαλρευ* and *ἔρρωσο* agree with this.

⁸ Arsames is a common name in Persian history of this period. Ctesias (Photius ed. Bekker, 42, 33) gives Arxanes as the name of a governor of Egypt, B.C. 424.

the priests of the god Khnoub which is in Elephantine covenanted ¹ with Vidrang, who was Usher ² here, that ³ they might remove from there the Temple of the God Jahu which is in the city of Elephantine. Thereupon, the aforementioned Vidrang Lakhâyâ ⁴ sent a letter to his son Nafyan, who was general in the city of Syene, saying : Let them destroy the Temple which is in the city of Elephantine. Thereupon Nafyan took Egyptians with other troops : they came to the city of Elephantine with their mattocks (?),⁵ entered the above temple, razed ⁶ it to the ground, broke

¹ The word in the text, המונית, is unknown. The fragmentary copy has "gave money and goods to." Since *ham* in Persian is a prefix signifying "together," it might seem that a Persian compound verb is intended.

² Usher : the original is פרתרר, which seems to be identical with the Armenian Hratarak, "herald," "crier." So Armenian has Hraman for *Firman* (Sansk. Pramâna), and the Armenian form is curiously found in the Aramaic of the Talmud. An official of the Persian court called εἰσαγγελεύς is mentioned by Herodotus (iii. 84) and Diodorus (xvi. 47). Perhaps, as applied to a governor, it meant "announcer of the king's will."

³ That they might : the particle לִּמְ is familiar in Syriac, where it invariably follows the first word or words of a quotation. If it is not a mistake of the scribe's, it should here have some sense like "in order that," or "that" only, as in the fragmentary copy.

⁴ The word following Vidrang, לִּהַיָּא, is puzzling, and from the place in which it occurs in the third papyrus, it can only be an epithet of Vidrang. Probably it is a local name, signifying "of Lakh," a place difficult to identify. One is inclined to think of Râgha, the Avestic name for the famous Rai, but this transliteration seems improbable.

⁵ The word conjecturally rendered "mattocks," תְּלִיָּהִם, is unknown. In default of a better suggestion, one is inclined to connect it with the Arabic *thalla*, "to pull down a house," usually found in connexion with the word 'urûsh, "houses." I have noted two cases of the occurrence of this word : a poet quoted in the commentary on Mutanabbi, ed. Dieterici, p. 466, says in *yaktulûka fakad thalalta 'urûshahum*, "if they kill you, you have pulled down their houses" : and the Romance of Hamzah, Beirut, 1886, i. 252, lâ budda lî min an athulla hâdhâ'l-'arsha waahdima dhâka 'l-'iwâna, "I must assuredly pull down this house and demolish that palace," which shows that the word is a synonym of hadama, the ordinary word for "to demolish." The substantive is not found in Arabic, except in the form thalal, meaning "destruction," "demolition."

⁶ The spelling נרשׁ for נרשׁ is, perhaps, merely an error, arising from the similarity of the sounds dh and th. In the portion of Dionysius of Tell-Mahré edited by Chabot there are examples of the opposite error, לחח for לחל and חחק for חחל.

the stone columns that were there. Moreover ¹ five stone portals, built ² of sculptured stone, which were in that temple, they destroyed: and they set them [on] ³ their heads: and they burned with fire the copper hinges in those marbles ⁴ and their cedar-wood roofing all together with the rest ⁵ of the building, and whatever else was there. And they took and appropriated the gold and silver chalices and whatever else was in that temple. Now from the days of the king of Egypt our fathers had built that temple in the city of Elephantine, and when Cambyses came to Egypt he found the temple built. And they destroyed all the temples of the Egyptian gods,⁶ but no one did any injury to that temple. And when they did thus, we, with our wives and children, put on sackcloth, and were fasting and praying to Jahu Lord of heaven, who showed us ⁷ [our desire] upon Vidrang Kalbâyâ. The ring ⁸ was removed from his feet, all the property which he possessed

¹ There is here an otiose הוה, as sometimes in Syriac.

² The original is בנין פסילה זי אבן. In Arabic the grammarians have a special rule whereby the nomen verbi of one verb can serve as cognate accusative to a synonymous verb. This would be the grammatical construction here.

³ Since "they set up their heads" would give no satisfactory sense, it is probable that the particle על has fallen out, as has also happened in a line below. The Greek ἐπι κεφαλῆν is similarly used for topsy-turvy.

⁴ This appears to mean "in the marble door-ways": for the doors themselves can scarcely have been of that material. Perhaps by "hinges" the writer means the doors themselves.

⁵ Sachau reads שירית; perhaps it can be read שירית and interpreted as above.

⁶ Diodorus, i. 46, § 4, "Cambyses burned the temples in Egypt."

⁷ "To show us upon" should, on the analogy of "to see upon," involve some such supplement as that suggested. There seems, however, a possibility that the word Kalbayyâ may mean, as usually, "dogs," and should be taken as the subject of the following sentence, implying that he was fettered in the open air, and eaten by dogs; see 1 Kings xxi. 23; Dionysius, ed. Chabot, 41. 7. In Jahiz, Hayawân 1. 109, several verses are quoted, describing the devouring of the dead by dogs; in one a man is stitched up in a sack, to prevent the dogs getting at him.

⁸ The Syriac כבלא means "anklet" as well as "fetter." Apparently (as Sachau suggests) the removal of the anklets from the feet must signify some form of degradation; or else the whole is a euphemism for execution.

was destroyed, and all those men who had devised mischief against the temple were slain. And we saw [our desire] upon them. Even before this at the time when this mischief was done unto us we sent a letter [to]¹ our Master, and to Jochanan the high-priest and his associates the priests which are in Jerusalem, and to Ostanēs brother of Anani,² but the nobles³ of the Jews sent no letter at all to us. Moreover from the day of Tammuz of the year 14 of king Dariohos until the present day we are clad in sackcloth and fasting: our wives are treated as widows: we have not anointed ourselves with oil, nor have we drunk wine. Moreover from then until the day⁴ of the 17th year of king Dariohos meal-offering, incense and burnt-offering have not been offered in that Temple. Now thy servants Jedoniah and his associates and all the Jews of Elephantine say thus: If our Master thinketh well to build this temple, seeing that they permit us not to build it, lo, unto thy clients and friends which are here in Egypt let a letter be sent from thee concerning the temple of the God Jahu in the city of Elephantine to build it, even as it was built before: and meal-offering, incense and burnt-offering shall be offered on the altar of the God Jahu in thy name, and we shall pray for thee at all times, we and our wives and children, and all the Jews that are here, if they do so that this temple be built. And there shall be to thee a right before Jahu, God of heaven, from one that sacrifices to Him burnt-offering

¹ The omission of "to" is apparently due to the scribe.

² This appears to be the natural rendering: When a man is described as the brother of some one else, it implies that the latter is better known than the former. An Ostanēs is mentioned by Diodorus as brother of Artaxerxes II: but it is difficult to regard Ananias as other than a Jewish name. Or could the words mean "his brother Ostanēs of the village or town Ananiah" (Neh. xi. 32)? Certainly we should have expected a preposition before it.

³ The Hôrîm of the Jews play a great part in the book of Nehemiah.

⁴ The day of the year: this rather implies that we have before us a rough draft in which details were afterwards to be filled up.

and sacrifice a sum equal to a [th]ousand silver talents.¹ And *concerning gold*² concerning this we have sent and given information; moreover all the words that are in this letter we have sent in our name unto Delayah and Shelam-yah, sons of Sanballat, governor of Samaria. Moreover, Arsames knoweth not concerning all this which was done to us. On the — of Marheshwan, year 17 of Dariohos the king.

A commentary to this valuable monument is to be found in Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 7, which may be given in its entirety.

At the death of the high-priest Elyashib, his son Judas (=Jehoiada) received the high-priesthood: and at his death his son John received the office, on whose account Bagoses, general of the other [?] Artaxerxes, defiled the Temple, and imposed a tribute upon the Jews, making them pay out of the public funds *fifty drachms for each lamb, before offering the daily sacrifice*.³ This was for the following reason. John had a brother Jesus, who, being the friend of Bagoses, received from him a promise of the high priest-hood. Relying on this promise, Jesus, having a dispute with John in the Temple, irritated his brother so that in a fit of anger he slew him. For a man holding a holy office, like John, to commit such a crime against his brother, was a terrible thing—indeed, so hideous an outrage had never

¹ The form kankar is Armenian. What a thousand silver talents would come to is not clear: one is tempted to think of the Sicilian talent, worth 3 or 6 denars, about which there is so much in Bentley's *Phalaris*. Even so the sum seems enormously high: but the figure given by Josephus as demanded by Bagoas for the daily sacrifices at Jerusalem is also very exorbitant.

² Apparently then Arsames is still nominally governor of Upper Egypt, and the writers are anxious to inform Bagoas that the outrage was effected without his consent.

³ The words in italics are apparently due to an error of the scribe.

occurred among Greeks or barbarians. The Divine power did not overlook it, for owing to this act the people were enslaved, and the Temple defiled by the Persians. For Bagoses, Artaxerxes's general, knowing that the high-priest of the Jews, John, had killed his own brother Jesus in the Temple, whereas he himself had, on a former occasion, been prevented by the Jews from entering the Temple, now assailed them, and began wrathfully to say, "Ye have dared to do murder in your Temple! Surely I am more holy than he who has committed a murder therein," and uttering this he entered within. And on this pretext Bagoses ill-treated the Jews for seven years after the death of Jesus.

After the death of John his son Jaddua received the high-priesthood. He had a brother named Manasseh, to whom Sanballat, who had been sent by the *last king Darius* as Satrap to Samaria, willingly gave his daughter Nikaso, knowing that Jerusalem was a fine city, whose kings had given much trouble to the Assyrians and Syrians. This Sanballat was by origin a Cuthaeon, of the same race as the Samaritans. He hoped by this alliance to secure the goodwill of the whole Jewish nation.

About this time Philip, king of Macedon, was treacherously killed by Pausanias, son of Cerastes, of the family of the Orestae, at Aegaeae. His son Alexander receiving the kingdom, crossed the Hellespont, and at the battle of Granicus defeated the generals of Darius. [The rest of this chapter may be given in summary.] The Jews, disapproving of the marriage of the high-priest's brother, demanded that he should either divorce his wife, or keep away from the altar, and with them the high-priest agreed. Manasseh approached Sanballat, saying that he preferred to retain his wife, but did not wish to lose the priesthood: so Sanballat said he would build Manasseh a Temple on

Mount Gerizim, and get a firman for it from king Darius.

The march of Darius to meet Alexander would, Sanballat thought, furnish an opportunity to get what he wanted, since Darius would certainly defeat Alexander, and be ready to grant favours on his return. Unfortunately Darius was defeated, and Sanballat deserted to the side of Alexander, and got the firman from him instead.

With this passage of Josephus the following of Diodorus Siculus, xvii. 5, § 3, should be compared: While Philip was still reigning the Persians were ruled by Ochus, who treated his subjects with great violence. He being hated owing to his cruelty, the chiliarch Bagoas, who was physically a eunuch, and of bad character, fond of war, poisoned Ochus by the aid of a physician, and placed his youngest son Arses on the throne. In the third year of his reign he was also slain by Bagoas, who placed on the throne one of his friends, named Darius, son of Arsanes, son of Ostanes, brother of the former king Artaxerxes.

About this Bagoas we hear something more in Diodorus, xvi. 47: A certain man was the most trusted of the king's (Artaxerxes Ochus's) friends next to Bagoas. Ibid. 51, § 2: When Artaxerxes had reduced all Egypt, and razed the walls of the most important towns, by plundering the temples, he got together a great quantity of gold and silver, and carried off the chronicles out of the ancient sanctuaries: these Bagoas afterwards for a great sum sold back to the Egyptian priests.

It seems evident ¹ that the Bagoas who is general of "the other" Artaxerxes in the record of Josephus is the same as the Bagoas of Diodorus. "The other," it should

¹ So Grätz, *Geschichte*, ii. 2, 211 n. Jüdeich, v. *infra*.

be observed, is a conjecture, and not necessarily a good one.

He might be thought, indeed, too distinguished a person to be confused with any other of the same name, having taken a part of great prominence, though not altogether successful, in the Egyptian campaign, and having made a compact with Mentor whereby the latter was to be supreme in the maritime parts of Asia, whereas Bagoas was to be supreme in the inland satrapies. In the story told by Diodorus he regards other men's religious scruples as a means of making money—restoring the records to the Egyptian priests for a good sum : and in the record of Josephus he acts in the same way, since he makes the Jews pay him a high fee for their daily sacrifices. Now it is difficult to dissociate the Bagoas of the Elephantine papyrus from the Bagoas of Josephus, since the personage of the papyrus demands a fee for sacrifices to be offered—i.e. the offer made by the Jews implies that they were acquainted with his practice, and demand leave to sacrifice on terms as good as those granted to the priests at Jerusalem. Then the opening words of the papyrus imply that he stood high in the king's favour, as the suppliants pray that he may have a thousand times as much of it as he now enjoys. And Diodorus insists repeatedly on the favour which his Bagoas enjoyed at the court of Artaxerxes III. One passage has been cited above : in the following § (xvi. 47, § 4) he says, "Bagoas, whom the king trusted especially" : a little later on (xvi. 60, § 5) he declares that Bagoas was master of the empire and the king did nothing without his consent. Hence it is difficult to dissociate the Bagoas of Diodorus from the person mentioned in the papyrus. For though the name Bagoas may have been common, that there should have been two persons of that name both high in the favour of their kings and both making money of men's scruples is *a priori* unlikely.

Moreover, the date of Josephus for his Bagoas is exactly confirmed by Diodorus, with whom Strabo agrees.

A Sanballat occurs in the record of Josephus as a governor sent to Samaria by the last Darius, i.e. the last king before Alexander's seizure of the empire. The papyrus shows that Sanballat must have been sent before: but the Sanballat who is brought by Josephus into connexion with Alexander cannot have been sent there by the Darius who reigned from 424-404. The account of Sanballat given in the book of Nehemiah can be brought into agreement with that of Josephus. The latter, as has been seen, charges the brother of the high-priest Jaddua with marrying Sanballat's daughter: and Nehemiah (xiii. 28) declares that he banished one of the sons of the high-priest Jehoiada for marrying a daughter of Sanballat. According to the same book (xii. 11) Jaddua was the son of Jonathan, son of Jehoiada; but this Jonathan does not appear to have been himself high-priest, and may perhaps have died early. In no case is there anything unusual about the use of the word "son" for "grandson." It is on the whole probable that Nehemiah himself left Jerusalem while Jehoiada was still high-priest, and that the continuation of the series in chapter xii. is due to a later hand.

The remaining synchronism in the papyrus is that of the high-priest Jochanan or John. Josephus makes this person high-priest immediately before Jaddua, and the book of Nehemiah (xii. 22) agrees with him, while making him the son of Elyashib (ibid. 23), and so brother of Jehoiada. If Nehemiah's Artaxerxes is Artaxerxes II. (404-361), and Josephus is right in making Jaddua die about 320 (soon after Alexander's death), the date of this Jochanan will be likely to include the year 340: it cannot possibly be brought up as early as the time of Darius II. (e.g. 407). The other lists of high-priests collected by Herzfeld omit Jochanan's

name, or rather substitute for it that of Jannaeus or Joatham: they do not put it higher up.

The papyrus confirms Josephus in making Sanballat governor of Samaria: but, if its date 17 of the king Darius be interpreted, as is natural, of Darius Nothus, Josephus's account of the founding of the Samaritan Temple, his bringing Sanballat into connexion with Alexander the Great, and Jochanan into connexion with the great Bagoas of Artaxerxes III.'s time must be quite unhistorical. He may then have committed two wrong identifications—that of the Darius under whom Sanballat was governor of Samaria with the *last* Darius, when he should have been identified with Darius Nothus; and that of the great Bagoas of the reign of Artaxerxes III. with the governor of Judaea, a far less important person of the reign of Darius Nothus. He will thereby have led into error some of the best historians: thus Jüdeich, *Kleinasiatische Studien*, p. 176, places the residence of Bagoas in the nearer East between the years 348–341 B.C. on the authority of the passage quoted from Josephus. The mention of Vidrang brings the newly-discovered papyri into connexion with the Sayce-Cowley collection, where he is associated with the third generation of a family which has left records dating from Xerxes, Artaxerxes, and Darius. In order to justify Josephus, we should have not only to interpret Darius in the papyri as Artaxerxes Ochus, but Xerxes as Darius Nothus. These operations conjointly would seem too violent to be permissible, without evidence that these names were also in use. On the other hand, the reduction of several detailed chapters of Josephus to fiction is an operation which is to be regretted.

The record of Nehemiah, on the other hand, appears to agree in the main with the data of the papyrus, since, if his Artaxerxes be interpreted as Longimanus, the papyrus quite naturally deals with personages of the next period,

Jochanan for Jehoiada, and the sons of Sanballat for Sanballat. The marriage of a daughter of Sanballat to a son of Jehoiada is also in order. It is curious that Nehemiah does not apply the name Pahath (satrap) to Sanballat, but (iii. 33) rather implies that he held that position, which Josephus, in agreement with the papyrus, actually assigns him. Whether the historical character of the book of Ezra—which has been more seriously questioned than that of Nehemiah—will gain by the discovery seems doubtful. The anachronism of Ezra x. 6 (in which Ezra goes to the chamber of Jochanan, son of Elyashib), which, according to Stade, *Geschichte*, ii. 153, belongs at the earliest to the commencement of the fourth century B.C., is at any rate put back a few years.

Still the great interest of Dr. Sachau's discovery is doubtless the evidence which it affords that the Israelites in these distant colonies had altars and sacrifices. Wellhausen's great work begins with the observation that in the first century A.D. both Samaritans and Jews were as convinced that there was only place where worship could be offered as they were that God was one. He then proves (or endeavours to prove) that Deuteronomy represents the stage at which this doctrine was still gaining ground, the Priestly Code the stage at which it was assumed or taken for granted. And now comes this document of 407 B.C., showing us that the Jews not only sacrificed elsewhere than at Jerusalem, but hoped for the approval of the community at Jerusalem when they endeavoured to get help to rebuild their altar and temple at Elephantine! And we are allowed to infer that the temple of Elephantine was possessed of vessels as costly as those of which we so often read as the property of the Temple at Jerusalem.

That this document and others which, it is to be hoped,

may follow quickly will long occupy the attention of Biblical critics may be safely predicted. They may be heartily congratulated on being enabled to build or rebuild some of their fabric on the solid basis of contemporary evidence, which, besides the information which it actually supplies, will be of the utmost value as a criterion of the credibility of previously known materials.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

NOTE ON THE ABOVE.

THE papyrus is of no small importance for the history of Egypt. The reference to Cambyses' severity is very interesting, though perhaps not quite convincing. Further, until the recent discoveries of Aramaic documents the whole of the periods of Persian rule from the end of Darius I. to the liberation of Egypt in the reign of Darius II.; and again, from the reconquest by Ochus to the arrival of Alexander, were practically unrepresented by contemporary monuments.

According to the ordinary view, this petition of the Jews, presented in the seventeenth year of Darius II. would have preceded the liberation of Egypt by only about a year. But the interesting parallels which Professor Margoliouth points out between the statements and references in the petition and those in Josephus and Diodorus, who are dealing ostensibly with persons and events belonging to the age of the latest Persian rulers, raise the question whether it would be possible to date the Elephantine papyrus to this later period. If this were so, we should find a confirmation of the idea in the fact that the only other group of papyri found in near connexion with the Aramaic series, was a number of Greek documents, dating

from the reign of Ptolemy Soter, and therefore following on the former with but a narrow gap between. These Greek papyri were discovered a little to the south of the Aramaic group (Sachau, p. 46). It may be remarked that the greater number of the Aramaic papyri still await publication.

The names of the early Persian rulers of Egypt, Cambyses, Darius I., Xerxes I. and Artaxerxes I., are all known on Egyptian monuments or papyri; those of the later kings are still unknown or unrecognized, unless Darius II. may occur in the Oasis of El Khargeh, and the last Darius on a legal document, in the Louvre, closely allied in formulae and style to those of Ptolemaic age. We cannot, therefore, be certain by what names these beings would be designated in documents from Egypt. But it would be very difficult to admit the seventeenth year of a Persian king of this time in Egypt. For, though the chronology of the period is somewhat uncertain, it is clear that none of them ruled so long over Egypt; it would be against the analogy of Cambyses' and Alexander's reigns if the years of a conqueror from before the conquest were counted to his rule in the province, and only to be explained as an abnormal usage in the separate Jewish community.

Egyptian words, and especially Egyptian names, are found in most of the Aramaic papyri from Egypt. In this papyrus, concerning solely Jewish affairs and addressed to Jerusalem, there is less probability of meeting with them. The doubtful word לְחִיָּא, in which Canon Driver is inclined to see a title of Widrang, is suggestive of one of the many Egyptian compounds, commencing with *lo-*, *le-*, "superintendent," "governor." With regard to כְּנֹכַר, in which [Professor Margoliouth has recognized the name of the talent, it is well known in Coptic as *kingôr*; while in demotic of the Ptolemaic age it is written *krkr*, and is

equivalent to 1,500 staters (tetradrachms). It has not yet been observed in earlier documents: indeed, so large an amount is not reached in those at present known. The sum of 1,000 silver talents is truly enormous, comparable to the whole tribute of the richest satrapies under Darius (Hdt. iii. 91). It seems necessary to suppose that the Jewish community at Elephantine was very wealthy and was here promising its utmost to an extortionate authority; even so 1,000 talents would not be expected from each member offering sacrifice in the restored temple; the meaning must surely be that, each of them would contribute his share to this bribe until the total was reached.

F. LL. GRIFFITH.

*THE JEWISH TEMPLE OF YAHU, GOD OF THE
HEAVENS, AT SYENE.*

BUT few months have elapsed since the publication of the Mond papyri, under the capable editorship of Professor Sayce and Mr. A. E. Cowley, introduced to the notice of Biblical students a Jewish colony of the fifth century B.C. at Syene in upper Egypt. Their importance was at once recognized, a considerable literature has already sprung up around them, and it would be premature to estimate exactly the place they will take in our conceptions of the period to which they belong. But while these are still fresh in our minds, and while they are still engaging the attention of specialists, the well-known orientalist, Professor Sachau of Berlin, has come forward with three more Aramaic papyri which place the Jews of Syene prominently in Biblical history, and illuminate the age in a manner which could never have been anticipated.¹ In brief, we now learn that the temple of Yahu, "the God of the Heavens," at Syene dated from the time of the Egyptian kings, had been spared by Cambyses but destroyed by the Egyptian priests in 410 B.C.; an appeal was made to Jehoḥanan and 'Anani the priests of Jerusalem, to Bagoas the governor of Judah, and to Delaiah and Shelemiah the sons of Sanaballat of Samaria; finally permission was given by Bagoas and Delaiah for the rebuilding.

Before giving some account of the sensational contents it will be useful to notice the internal situation preceding the year 410. We had seen in the Mond papyri an extremely

¹ *Drei aramäische Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine*, by Professor Ed. Sachau, 1 facsimile (*Abhandlungen d. königl.-preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften*, Berlin, 1907).

prosperous circle of Jewish families, closely united, and living on intimate terms with individuals whose names are Egyptian, Persian, Babylonian. These jostle one another in everyday life even as was the case at Nippur, where the contract-tablets of the same period reveal a similar mingling of names. In Egypt, as in Babylonia, one gathered that life was tolerable under an empire which had not upset earlier conditions; and although much more external evidence is needed before one can gauge their precise character, it is not without some significance that Têma in North Arabia has shown the existence or persistence of Assyrio-Babylonian culture, probably of the fifth century B.C.¹; that Assyrian contract-tablets of the middle of the seventh century have been unearthed at Gezer; that the description of purchase-deeds in the time of Jeremiah is suggestive of Babylonian usage; and that the same influence can be traced in the legal terms of the Mond papyri. All these are *membra disjecta*, and the skeleton cannot yet be reconstructed, but they serve as a preparation for the appreciation of the significance of the new 'finds.'

Now the earlier papyri of Syene had vividly illustrated one aspect of Jewish life—the commercial. In 470 B.C. we were introduced to Maḥseiaḥ son of Jedoniah.² A few years later he defended his title to some estate which his Persian neighbour Dargman had claimed. When, in 459, he married his daughter Mibtah-yah to Jezaniah the son of Uriah he endowed her with property, and particularly enjoined her to keep Dargman's deed of renunciation in case of future dispute. In 446 the daughter received more property from her father, and six years later she is trading on her own account with an Egyptian builder. Subsequently she married As-Hor, who becomes known

¹ See G. A. Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, pp. 196–198.

² The names are vocalized here after their nearest Hebrew analogies.

as Nathan, and her two sons Yedoniah and Maḥsciah appear in papyri of 421, 417 and 411; at the last-mentioned date they are peacefully dividing between them their mother's [slaves. One gathered that the temple (the Babylonian word *ekurru* was used) of the God Yahu stood in the immediate vicinity of the families, and in the courts the Jews take the oath in his name. In one case, where an Egyptian was concerned, the Jewess Mibtaḥ-yah swears by the goddess Sati, and another papyrus mentions a priest of the Egyptian deities who is living in their midst, and, it would even seem, in the closest proximity to the Jewish temple.¹ Incidental though these references are, it was at once pointed out by Professor Sayce in his introductory remarks, that the Jewish names on the papyri "are compounded with that of Yahveh quite as much as the names of the orthodox Jews who returned to Palestine from the captivity." But what form the cult of the God Yahu took was quite a matter for conjecture.

It is at this stage that the Berlin papyri enable us to take up the thread, and the three texts which Professor Sachau has just published are written under vastly different circumstances. Two of them are duplicates; one quite complete, the other mutilated at the sides, but of extreme interest for its variant readings. They [are dated in the 17th year of] Darius (408-7 B.C.); the third is evidently somewhat later. The duplicates are [addressed to "our lord Bagohi the governor of Jēhūd (i.e. Judah)"; the *name* is identical with that of Bigvai, for which the Septuagint has given the more correct form Bagoi (cp. 1 Esdr. v. 14), and it corresponds to the more familiar Bagoas.² The letter is from "thy servants Jedoniah and his colleagues, priests

¹ This is based upon papyri E and J. The word for "priest" is that which in the Old Testament is restricted to idolatrous priests.

² In the following paragraphs the wording of the original has been followed as closely as possible except where abstracts are given.

that are in the fortress Yeb (i.e. Elephantine)." Commencing with the usual "Peace!" it expresses the wish that "our Lord, God of the Heavens" may give him long life, that he may "grant him mercy before Darius the king and the household, a thousandfold more than at the present." It reports that the "idolatrous priests" (see note p. 499) of the god Hnûb that were in the fortress Yeb had taken advantage of the absence of Arsham to intrigue against them in the month Tammuz in the fourteenth year of Darius. Arsham has been identified with the Persian governor Arsanes, mentioned by Ctesias, and the situation is that already represented upon a small piece of papyrus published by Professor Euting in 1903, where the (unknown) writers aver that they had not forsaken their lord, that nought of harm could be found in them, but that the priests of Hnûb had bribed the commander Widrang (?) with silver and treasure (also mentioned on one of the duplicates). Although this text is of difficult interpretation, needless to say, it and several other extant papyri will now have to be re-examined in the new light. This Widrang (the name is uncertain) had previously appeared in a papyrus of 420. He listens to the conspirators who wish to see the "temple of the God Yahu" removed, and instructs his son, a captain in Syene, to destroy the edifice. The latter accordingly takes a force of Egyptians, enters the temple, and pulls it "to the ground."

The details are rather obscure, but we learn that the pillars of stone were broken, also that there were seven great stone gates and a roofing (?) of cedar. Allusion is made to the "wall" (? the word in Ezra v. 3, 9), but the meaning of the context is not clear. The edifice was burned, and the Egyptians carried off the bowls of gold and silver and the various things that were to be found. Next comes the remarkably interesting statement: "From

the days of the kings of Egypt our fathers had built this temple in the fortress Yeb, and when Cambyses (*Kanbūzi*) entered Egypt he found this temple built, and the temples of the gods of Egypt were all overthrown; but no one did any harm in this temple." But, now, since this disaster, they with their wives and sons had been "wearing sackcloth, and fasting and praying to Yahu, God of the Heavens." A rather obscure sentence seems to describe the punishment of the Egyptians: Widrang lost all the treasures which he possessed, and "all the men who sought evil against this temple were all killed." No ambiguity, fortunately, is attached to the highly suggestive complaint: "Before this, at the time when this evil was done unto us, we sent a letter to our lord (i.e. Bagoas), and unto Jehoḥanan the great (i.e. high) priest and his colleagues, priests that are in Jerusalem, and unto Ustān his brother, that is 'Anānī, and the nobles of the Judaeans; but they sent no letter unto us." It may be added that Professor Sachau in his valuable notes observes that the Persian name taken by 'Anānī (cp. 1 Chron. iii. 24) appears in the Mond papyri (440 B.C., the father of Nebo-reī) and is also that of a governor of Babylon and Syria under Darius I.

The effect of the destruction of the temple is described with startling vividness: "Also from the day of Tammuz, the 14th year of Darius, even unto this day, we have been wearing sackcloth and fasting, our women have been made like widow(s); we have not anointed with oil, and wine we have not drunk; also from then unto the day (see date below) of the 17th year of Darius, they have not brought into this temple meal, incense (*lēbōnāh*) and burnt offerings." At once one recalls the laments of the prophets at the tragic fate of another temple, and so familiar do the words of the priest sound, that it is at first difficult to realize that Jerusalem is some 550 miles distant from Syene in a straight

line. Now comes the real object of the letter: it is an appeal to Bagohi from "thy servants Jedoniah and his colleagues and the Judaeans, all the citizens (*ba'ale*) of Yeb," begging him to send a letter to his friends in Egypt with instructions that the temple be rebuilt as it was in aforetime. The Jews are evidently the object of hostility, "for they do not allow us to build it"—the situation can be easily understood from the history of Ezra and Nehemiah. In return for this, "meal, incense and burnt-offerings shall be brought near upon the altar of Yahu the God in thy name, and we shall pray for thee at all times, we and our wives and our sons, and the Jews all that are here." There is a difficult reference to some more material acknowledgement, and it would seem (according to Professor Sachau) that they promise Bagohi a grant or due, before Yahu, from every one who brought in burnt and sacrificial offerings. However, the concluding words are quite beyond doubt, and they tell us that the Jews of Syene have also communicated these matters in a letter to "Delaiah and Shelemiah the sons of Sanaballat (four syllables as in the Septuagint) the governor of Samaria (*Shāmērayin*)." The date is given: the 20th Marheshvan (November), the 17th year of Darius the king.

The sequel to this remarkable pair of documents is doubtless to be found in the third of Professor Sachau's papyri, a small but apparently complete text which is undated. It is styled a record or memorandum and comprises the commands given by Bagohi and Delaiah to the writer. The latter is instructed to tell Arsham in Egypt that the "altar-house of the God of the Heavens that was built in the fortress Yeb from aforetime, before Cambyses," was to be rebuilt "in its place" (cp. Ezra vi. 7) as it was formerly, and that meal and incense offerings should be offered "upon this altar according as was done in former times."

Although these papyri contain several difficulties there is no ambiguity attached to the main outlines or to the evidence which is obviously so valuable for Biblical study. As is so often the case with external evidence they throw light upon old problems, but bring new ones in their train. Thus, we find that in 407 B.C. Bagohi of Judah, Jehoḥanan the high priest of Jerusalem, and the sons of Sanaballat of Samaria were contemporaries. But according to Josephus the high-priest John, the son of Judas (Joiada) and grandson of Eliashib, slew his brother Jesus, who was a friend of Bagoes, and some reference is made to a seven years' punishment. John was succeeded by Jaddua, whose brother Manasses married the daughter of Sanballat, the governor appointed by Darius the last Persian king, and the Samaritan schism comes at the time of the invasion of Alexander the Great.¹ On the other hand, according to the Biblical evidence, Eliashib was the contemporary of Nehemiah, who, in the 32nd year of Artaxerxes, cast out his kinsman Tobiah (Neh. xiii. 4-9), and also drove out from the priesthood one of the sons of Joiada who had married Sanballat's daughter. From the Berlin papyri it is evident that Jehoḥanan and 'Anani were brothers, and presumably were sons of Joiada, but no allusion can be found to any strained relations between Judah and Samaria, and the third papyrus actually associates Delaiah (presumably the son of Sanballat) and Bagohi the Judaeen governor.

But, apart from this and various other problems, the real positive gains to our knowledge are very considerable. The possession of duplicates is a particularly interesting feature, since each contains inaccuracies, and there are instructive though not important variant readings. In the Mond papyri we saw only one side of Jewish activity ;

¹ See Josephus, *Antiq.* xi., chap. xii. seq.

no light is thrown upon the Egyptian revolt in the time of Artaxerxes II., it fell outside the scope of the documents. Now, however, in the history from 410 to 407, the Jews appear in quite another light, and it would be difficult to form a just idea of their business relations. The loss of the temple overshadows everything, and until the routine of the sacrifices is resumed the religious observances are at a standstill. We gain a fair idea of this temple at Syene; it was no mean edifice, and where there were priests, offerings and temple-vessels, one may infer that there was a duly organized temple-service—and perhaps a literature. There is no reason, also, why Syene should not have had its prophets in its darkest days. With these papyri, it is quite within the realms of possibility that fresh discoveries may furnish more evidence of the cult of “Yahu, the God of the Heavens.”¹

The sons of Sanaballat bear names which point to the worship of Yahveh; but even an Ammonite could be called Tobiah and could style his son Jehoħanan (Neh. vi. 18). But the worship of Yahveh does not necessarily involve the conceptions which were held by advanced prophets or by the adherents of the more exclusive Judaism of Ezra and Nehemiah. One knows that certain practices were associated with the worship of Yahveh which were utterly repugnant to the prophets; consequently even Jeremiah's denunciations of the Jews in Egypt do not necessarily prove that they had forsaken Yahveh for another. The value of the papyri must not be exaggerated, and their evidence must not be unduly pressed beyond legitimate limits. If, for example, they show how closely

¹ Considerable interest is attached also to the other papyri at Berlin which are not yet published, also to the numerous astraca which Prof. Clermont-Ganneau of Paris recently obtained. The latter are said to give receipts and notes of various kinds and proceed from Jewish families.

the indulgences granted to Jerusalem by the Persian kings accord with actual situations elsewhere, it will be noticed that since Delaiah (the son of Sanaballat) and Bagohi unite in permitting the rebuilding of the temple of Syene—they call it an “altar-house”—the Jews doubtless carried out the promises they had made. Accordingly, while we emphasize the resemblance between the fortunes of the two temples, it is also important to notice carefully the differences as represented in the sources at our disposal.

It is unnecessary to notice further the numerous interesting points which these papyri raise; the language, phraseology, the historical questions, etc., etc., will assuredly hold a prominent place in future Biblical research. There is considerable difference of opinion in regard to many important phases of exilic and post-exilic history, and it is to be desired that the new evidence will be examined without preconceived views or theories. The related Biblical narratives have for some time past been found to contain serious internal problems, and several earnest attempts have been made to grapple with them. With the growing store of external evidence, particularly of evidence from the Jews themselves, several arguments no longer appear to be adequate or conclusive. Certain conclusions—“conservative,” “moderate” and “extreme,” require overhauling, and the entire body of evidence for this extremely important age now stands in need of a fresh and impartial reconsideration.

STANLEY A. COOK.

*THE PHILOLOGY OF THE GREEK BIBLE:
ITS PRESENT AND FUTURE.¹*

III.

SEPTUAGINT PHILOLOGY.

OUR discussion in the second lecture on methods of studying the language of the Greek Bible may be said to result in two requirements, one for specialization of the study, the other for its incorporation as a branch in the larger complex of studies dealing with late Greek.

For future linguistic work on the Greek Bible, particularly the Septuagint, on these lines we now possess an auxiliary of more than ordinary importance in a great three-volume concordance that has recently been completed: the *Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Translations of the Old Testament*, by Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath.² Apart from the "Indices" to some classical authors and concordances to the more important English poets books of this sort are really a speciality of the theological tool-basket. Originally, no doubt, they were designed to assist in practical exegesis, but they now form part of the indispensable apparatus of scientific investigation. They enable us to take a rapid survey of the uses of words, forms, and constructions, and though they may seem to be a satire on the saying that the Scripture cannot be broken, if rightly used they do indeed promote the more intimate knowledge of the Bible.

¹ These lectures were delivered in the Summer School of the Free Churches, at Cambridge, in July and August, 1907. In writing them I allowed myself the use of part of an address given by me at Giessen in 1897. The lectures were translated for me by Mr. Lionel R. M. Strachan, M.A., Lector of English in the University of Heidelberg.

² Oxford, 1892-1906, 3 vols.

The chief requisites indispensable in any concordance are trustworthiness and completeness of statement. The old Septuagint Concordance by Tromm,¹ to which one was formerly obliged to have recourse, did not fulfil these requirements. It was published in 1718 and is responsible for a good deal of original sin in the quotations to be found in commentaries.

The new Concordance was prepared and begun under the auspices of Hatch, who, however, did not live to witness the publication of even the first instalment. He died, according to human reckoning, much too early, on the eleventh of November, 1889, at Oxford. I consider the preparation of the Septuagint Concordance to have been his greatest service to learning. That monumental work is the abiding fulfilment of the simple aspiration that Hatch himself once expressed in verse :

For me . . .
To have been a link in the chain of life :
Shall be immortality.

Like all human work, it is not free from errors, but it is on the whole thoroughly trustworthy. One of its chief advances on its predecessor is shown in the attention paid to those minute words, the particles, which are of such great interest philologically. Schmiedel,² however, is certainly right in wishing that in the case of particles the editors had not only noted the passages but also printed them in full. It is really, in some cases, of more importance to be able to inform oneself rapidly concerning the uses of the particle *ἄν* than to be able to trace in long lists the occurrence of such a word as *ἄνθρωπος*.

It is a defect, in my opinion, that the principle of absolute completeness has not been carried out. Thus, for example,

¹ Abraham Tromm, *Concordantiae Graecae versionis LXX. Interpretum*, Amstelodami et Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1718 (2 vols., folio).

² Winer-Schmiedel, p. xv.

the personal pronouns are not given, or rather they are only recorded with the addition of the word *passim*—a remark which may of course mean very much or very little. Not long ago I had occasion to examine the uses of the solemn formula “I am,” ἐγὼ εἰμί, which occurs in the Gospel of St. John and in inscriptions relating to the cult of Isis. Here the Concordance, article ἐγὼ, failed to assist me, for the ἐγὼ εἰμι which it records is something different. In this case of course it was possible to look for εἰμι in the article εἶναι; but what is to be done when the grammarian wishes to examine the use of the emphatic ἐγὼ or σὺ?

I am unable to agree with the aggrieved complaint of Cremer,¹ to whom the statistical system followed in the Concordance seems to be a mistake. On the contrary, I consider it an advantage that we now obtain more rapid information as to the linguistic usages of the separate books. The numbers appended always will afford information as to the Hebrew original for which the Greek word stands. We must also be grateful for the notice taken of the chief variants in the manuscripts. Many details of importance in the history of the language are concealed in them. For example, the word δοκίμιος, of great importance in two places² in the New Testament where it was not recognized, can be established from Septuagint variants, and its occurrence is then confirmed by the papyri.

The third volume is particularly valuable. It contains a Concordance of proper names in the Septuagint and other translations which may be called epoch-making as regards the study of Semitic and Greek sounds and pronunciation. It contains further a Concordance of the parts of the Greek Ecclesiasticus where corresponding Hebrew equivalents can be given. Thirdly, there is new Hexaplaric material,

¹ *Bibl.-Theol. Wörterbuch*, 8th ed., p. xv. f.

² *Jas.* i. 3, *1 Pet.* i. 7.

chiefly from the discoveries of Dr. Mercati in the Vatican Library; and finally there is an Index to the Hebrew words in the whole work.

This last index possesses an importance that has not yet been generally recognized. We knew already from the Greek Concordance that the Septuagint exhibits a striking simplification of the vocabulary of its original. One single Septuagint word serves not infrequently to translate a hundred and more different words in the Hebrew. How far this reduction of the copiousness of the Hebrew was neutralized by Hebrew words receiving a variety of Greek translations, it was hitherto, except by very troublesome work with the Hebrew Concordance, impossible to ascertain. The Hebrew index of the Oxford Concordance has now made it possible to examine with both speed and accuracy this not unimportant question in the statistics of the language. We see that there are also Hebrew words which the translators have rendered in over a hundred different ways. The same index will also prove of excellent service for investigating the peculiarities of the individual translators.

The work is printed with simple English elegance and will remain for years and perhaps for centuries the only one of its kind. Remembering this we can only repeat with deep gratitude the words of the surviving editor, Henry A. Redpath, in his last preface, dated May, 1906, where he describes the work as a labour of love. Truly, such a monumental work could not have been created without love and enthusiasm.

A Concordance does not pretend to be a positive advancement of philology; but it can be the stimulus to a revival of the study, for it is to the scholar the same as a large, well-arranged herbarium is to the botanist—material for research in conveniently accessible form.

Other equally important auxiliaries for students of the

Septuagint are the new editions of the text. Oxford presented us with the new Concordance, and Cambridge is giving us the new text. First Henry Barclay Swete produced a highly successful manual edition of the Vatican text,¹ with the variants of the other most important manuscripts, and supplemented it with the first Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek.² His labours are the most important that have been bestowed on the Septuagint since Lagarde's valuable work in the last third of the nineteenth century. His Introduction in particular is at once a compendium of all the earlier Septuagint philology and a stimulus for all future work on the subject.

Then the "large" Cambridge Septuagint³ began to appear, Genesis being published in 1906 as the first part of the first volume. This great work was also originally under the management of Swete, but when he was obliged to relinquish the execution of the larger plan in 1895 it was entrusted to Alan England Brooke and Norman McLean. The Cambridge Septuagint does not aim at determining the primitive text—the time is not yet ripe for that—but it tries to give a collection, as complete and trustworthy as possible, of all the materials for the text, which, since the great Oxford edition of Holmes and Parsons,⁴ have been greatly increased. Such a collection of the materials was as necessary as daily bread to Biblical philology. I was

¹ *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Edited by H. B. Swete, 3 vols., Cambridge 1887-94; 2nd ed., 1895-1900; 3rd ed., 1901-7.

² *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, by H. B. Swete. Cambridge, 1900; 2nd ed., 1902.

³ *The Old Testament in Greek according to the text of Codex Vaticanus*, supplemented from other uncial manuscripts, with a critical apparatus containing the variants of the chief ancient authorities for the text of the Septuagint. Edited by Alan E. Brooke and Norman McLean. Vol. i., Part I., Genesis. Cambridge, 1906.

⁴ R. Holmes and J. Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus*, Oxonii, 1798-1827 (5 vols.).

at the Hamburg Congress of Orientalists in 1902, when Professor Nestle made the first authentic announcements concerning the forthcoming work based on an article by Brooke and McLean, and there can be no doubt that all present were impressed by the extreme importance of the matter. The Genesis which has since appeared has not disappointed our highest expectations. The editors have worked with the greatest accuracy. All the available witnesses to the text have been cited, down to the most recently published papyri, including the most important cursive manuscripts, the old translations, Philo, the New Testament, and the quotations in the old ecclesiastical writers. The thread upon which everything is strung is usually, as in Swete's edition, the Codex Vaticanus. The typography is a masterpiece of the Cambridge University Press.

It is to be hoped that, as we now possess such splendid new auxiliaries, Biblical philology will address itself to the great task of compiling a Septuagint Lexicon. It would be quite mistaken policy to postpone work on the Lexicon till we have something like a critical text. That would be putting it off till the Greek Kalends. But we can begin at once. A Lexicon is not intended to last for centuries; it does duty only until it is relieved by a better one, and the textual critic is the last person who can afford to do without a Lexicon. Hitherto we have had only the old Septuagint Dictionary by Biel,¹ or the revision of it by Schleusner,² which is a rather insipid adaptation of Tromm's

¹ Joannes Christianus Biel, *Novus Thesaurus Philologicus; sive Lexicon in LXX. et alios interpretes et scriptores apocryphos veteris Testamenti*. Ex Biellii autoris manuscripto edidit ac praefatus est E. H. Mutzenbecher. Hagae Comitum, 1779-80 (3 parts).

² Johann Friedrich Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus philologico-criticus; sive Lexicon in LXX. et reliquos interpretes Graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti*. Post Biellium et alios viros doctos congressit et edidit

Concordance, useless at the present day except as a collection of material. The Key to the Old Testament Apocrypha by Christian Abraham Wahl¹ is better in its way, but also no longer up to the standard of modern requirements. Particularly for the Septuagint Lexicon the inscriptions and papyri are of the very greatest importance.

Recent years have produced only preliminary studies for the future lexicon. Those contributed by Hermann Cremer in his *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*² must on no account be forgotten. Yet I cannot help feeling that partly at least they are influenced by the belief in "Biblical" Greek, and I consider critical revision to be imperative. The same applies to the lexical work in Hatch's *Essays in Biblical Greek*,³ which are full of fine observations. H. A. A. Kennedy, in his *Sources of New Testament Greek*,⁴ a book which is unfortunately not always correct in its detailed statements, supplies many correct illustrations of the vocabulary of the Septuagint, and afterwards of the New Testament, from contemporary Greek sources. A gratifying piece of work in the form of a doctoral dissertation was published at Halle in 1894 by Heinrich Anz,⁵ investigating the relation of two hundred and eighty-nine verbs in the Pentateuch with the popular language. The conception of "Biblical" Greek, which

J. F. Schleusner. Lipsiae, 1820-1821, 5 parts; editio altera, locupletata, Londini, 1829, 3 vols.

Lexici in Interpretes Graecos Veteris Testamenti, maxime Scriptores Apocryphos spicilegium. Post Bielium congressit et edidit J. F. Schleusner, Lipsiae, 1784-86, 2 vols.

¹ C. A. Wahl, *Clavis librorum Veteris Testamenti Apocryphorum philologica*, Lipsiae, 1853.

² See above.

³ See above.

⁴ See above.

⁵ Heinrich Anz, *Subsidia ad cognoscendum Graecorum sermonem vulgarem e Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina repetita.* Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses, vol. XII., Halis Sax., 1894.

might so easily have been an obstacle to the work, obviously causes the author few misgivings. He takes the Book of the Seventy frankly for what it is and what it claims to be, and treats it as a specimen of popular Greek. His investigations into the history of the words selected impress one as thoroughly sound, and may be regarded as preliminary studies for the Septuagint Dictionary. It is a pity that the more recent papyrus discoveries were not then accessible to the author.

In 1897 and 1899 the Professor of Theology at Utrecht, J. M. S. Baljon,¹ published a Dictionary of Early Christian Literature, which as regards the New Testament articles was founded on Cremer. It professes to contain the vocabulary of the Septuagint and its satellites, besides that of the New Testament and of early Christian literature in general. The idea of constructing a common dictionary for the whole of this large field is undoubtedly a good one, but one cannot help suspecting that the idea is *too* great for the present time. A lexicon, whether to the Septuagint or to the New Testament, cannot be constructed offhand, if it is to contain what we have a right nowadays to expect. Blass criticized the book² and found in it not a little that a philologist could not approve. With all admiration for Baljon's industry it must nevertheless be said that he does not even touch, much less solve, the really great problems of a Septuagint Dictionary.

In 1895 a Cambridge committee drew up a plan for a Dictionary of the Septuagint, but Swete some time ago informed us that the plan had been suspended for the present. This is highly regrettable, but the reasons for the suspension are intelligible to any one who knows the present

¹ J. M. S. Baljon, *Grieksch-theologisch Woordenboek hoofdzakelijk van de oud-christelijke letterkunde*, Utrecht, 1895-99, 2 parts.

² *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1897, xxii. col. 43 f.

position of research. The difficulties are very great, and those peculiar to a Septuagint Dictionary are commonly underestimated. People think that the problem is solved by ascertaining what Hebrew word or words are represented by the Septuagint word. They then look up the meaning of the Hebrew and thus obtain what they consider the "meaning" of the Septuagint word. Equivalence of the words—an obvious fact, easily ascertainable—is taken without further ado to denote equivalence in the ideas conveyed.

People forget that the Septuagint has often substituted words of its own rather than translated. All translation, in fact, implies some, if only a slight, alteration of the sense of the original. The meaning of a Septuagint word cannot be deduced from the original which it translates or replaces but only from other remains of the Greek language, especially from those Egyptian sources that have lately flowed so abundantly. Even Professor Blass, I am glad to say, took up this position at last—a position which, unfortunately, is not conceded at once, but has to be slowly won by combat with an unmethodical school.

To give one example: Baljon in his *Lexicon* gives as meanings for the Septuagint word *ἄρκευθος* "olive tree" and "cypress tree." The Hebrew words for these two trees are certainly sometimes rendered *ἄρκευθος* by the translators, and so Baljon concludes that in the language of the Septuagint *ἄρκευθος* had these meanings. No, says Blass¹ very truly, *ἄρκευθος* means "juniper," and "a wrong translation does not turn the juniper into an olive or a cypress." There can be no doubt about that.

I can perhaps make my point clearer by an analogy. In the English Authorized Version the "terebinth" of the original is usually translated "oak" (Isa. i. 29; Gen. xxxv. 4). On the analogy of Baljon's article a Dictionary of the

¹ Col. 44.

Authorised Version would have to say that "oak" meant "terebinth," whereas the truth of the matter is that the English translators, like Luther in the German translation, have rendered the Hebrew—I will not say wrongly, but—inexactly. They have Anglicized and Luther has Germanized the Oriental tree.

In the case of Septuagint words of importance in the history of religion the unhappy confusing influence of the mechanical equating process is shown still more clearly; the apparent and external equivalence of words is made the basis of far-reaching deductions. Even a Septuagint scholar like Eberhard Nestle, whose scattered notes are usually most instructive, does not keep altogether clear of this method.

As an example to illustrate this whole subject I may mention the word *ἱλαστήριον*. You will read of this word in many respectable books on theology that in Septuagint Greek or in "Biblical" Greek it "means" "the lid of the ark of the covenant," because the corresponding Hebrew word "kapporeth" is in most cases so translated by modern scholars. Now the etymology of the word, confirmed by certain inscriptions, shows that *ἱλαστήριον* means "object of expiation or propitiation." In choosing the word *ἱλαστήριον* to denote the lid of the ark of the covenant the Septuagint has not translated the concept of "lid" but has replaced it by another concept which brings out the sacred purpose of the ark. The lid of the ark of the covenant is an *ἱλαστήριον*, but it does not follow that *ἱλαστήριον* means "lid" either in the Septuagint, in St. Paul, or anywhere else; it can only mean "expiatory or propitiatory object."

A large proportion of the so-called "Biblical" meanings of words common to all forms of the Greek language owe their existence in the dictionaries solely to this mechanical equating process. In order to effect such comparisons of words

there is no need of a lexicon at all; the concordance is sufficient. The lexicon has very different and much more complicated tasks before it. It must exhibit the Greek word in the history of its uses, availing itself specially of the linguistic remains that are locally and temporally most appropriate. It must try to discover and explain the discrepancies of meaning between words equated with one another by the comparative method.

This task is as profitable as it is vast. It will be discovered that the translators, despite their reverence for the syntactical peculiarities of their original, have made liberal use of their own every-day vocabulary, especially in the case of technical and expressive phrases. This has been shown in an instructive essay by B. Jacob¹ on the Book of Esther. Various details will be found in the writings of Jean Antoine Letronne² and Giacomo Lumbroso³ on Egyptian history under the Ptolemies, and in the still valuable work of H. W. J. Thiersch on the Greek Pentateuch.⁴

As examples of the Egyptianizing and, from their point of view, modernizing tendency of the translators, I may quote the following. In the book of Esther (ii. 21) certain officials are mentioned who bear the title of "keepers of the threshold." The Septuagint renders this title by ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ, that is "chief of the body-guard," a designation

¹ B. Jacob, *Das Buch Esther bei den LXX.*, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1890, x. p. 241 ff.

² J. A. Letronne, *Recherches pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte pendant la domination des Grecs et des Romains*, tirées des inscriptions grecques et latines, relatives à la chronologie, à l'état des arts, aux usages civils et religieux de ce pays. Paris, 1823.—*Recueil des Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de l'Égypte*, étudiées dans leur rapport avec l'histoire politique, l'administration intérieure, les institutions civiles et religieuses de ce pays, depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à celle des Arabes. Paris, 1842-8.

³ G. Lumbroso, *L'Egitto dei Greci e dei Romani*; seconda edizione . . . accresciuta di un appendice bibliografica. Roma, 1895.—*Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*. Turin, 1870.

⁴ Heinrich Wilhelm Josias Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina libri tres*. Erlangae, 1840.

that occurs in Egyptian inscriptions and papyri¹ as the title of an official in the court of the Ptolemies.

In Joel i. 20, describing the distress of the land, it is said that the rivers of waters are dried up. The Egyptian translators have turned the "rivers of waters" into "canals," thus making the description much more life-like to Egyptian readers.

In Genesis i. 2 ff. it is written that the physicians embalmed the body of Jacob. The Septuagint says *ἐνταφιασται* instead of "physicians" (*ἰατροί*), for *ἐνταφιαστής*, as we know from a papyrus² of the first century B.C., was the technical term for members of the guild that looked after embalming.

Thiersch's little book, already mentioned, consists chiefly of grammatical studies of the translation of the Pentateuch. It is in every respect a most excellent performance, and was in many points decidedly in advance of its times. Unfortunately, for a long period Thiersch had practically no followers. Purely grammatical investigations of the Septuagint were altogether wanting except what was now and then contained in Grammars of the New Testament, especially Schmiedel's.³ The spell was broken by Swete in his Introduction.⁴ His fourth chapter, containing an account of the Greek of the Septuagint, includes an outline of the grammar; another is given by Conybeare and Stock⁵ in their *Selections from the Septuagint*, which will be referred to again presently. A larger Septuagint Grammar is announced as in preparation by Thackeray, the editor of the Epistle of Aristeeas in Swete's Introduction.

In the autumn of 1907 there was published, after

¹ Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 2nd ed., p. 98.

² *Ibid.*, p. 120 f.

³ See above.

⁴ See above, note ² p. 510.

⁵ See below, note ² p. 519.

years of preliminary labour, a German Septuagint Grammar by R. Helbing,¹ closely in touch with the recent developments of Greek philology, and based upon an exact study of the enormous materials drawn from the three parallel sources—inscriptions, papyri, and late authors. The extent of the material furnished merely by the papyri of the Ptolemaic age, contemporary with the Septuagint, may be judged from the highly meritorious *Grammar of Greek Papyri of the Ptolemaic Epoch* recently published by Edwin Mayser,² who, like Helbing, has turned his attention in the first place to the Phonology and Accidence. The syntactical problems will be treated in separate volumes by both scholars.

The exegesis of the Septuagint forms by itself a special department of Septuagint philology. Its aim is to interpret the Greek Old Testament as the *Greek Bible*. The Seventy represented a Hellenization of Semitic monotheism on a great scale, and their work became a force in literature and in the history of religion, just like Luther's Bible in later times. But, apart from commentaries on the Old Testament by ancient fathers of the Church, exegetical works on the Septuagint compiled in earlier times are unknown. Such work was neglected probably because the Septuagint was generally used simply as a means for the reconstruction of the Hebrew original text, and because the few who were interested in the contents of the book for its own sake were much too strongly inclined to believe that the sense of the Greek text was one and the same with that of the Semitic original. In countless instances, however, the sense of the two texts does not coincide—and then is the time for Septuagint exegesis to step in: it is a fine large field, and until lately was quite unworked.

¹ Robert Helbing, *Grammatik der Septuaginta Laut- und Wortlehre*, Göttingen, 1907.

² See above.

Two beginnings have recently been made, one by R. R. Ottley in his *Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint*,¹ and the other by F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, who in their *Selections from the Septuagint*² have provided a series of stories from the historical books of the Septuagint with a detailed introduction and exegetical notes. A third work has been begun by a military chaplain at Hamburg named Adolph Schettler, who intends to write a commentary on selected Septuagint Psalms. The English translation of the Septuagint by Charles Thomson,³ which I have not yet seen

¹ *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint, Codex Alexandrinus*. Translated and edited by R. R. Ottley. With a parallel version from the Hebrew. Cambridge, 1904, 1906. 2 vols.

² *Selections from the Septuagint according to the text of Swete*. Boston (U.S.A.) and London [1905]. (Ginn & Co.'s College Series of Greek Authors.)

³ [Translator's Note]. Charles Thomson (1719-1824) was Secretary to Congress, United States of America. His translation of the Septuagint was printed at Philadelphia, 1808, and was apparently the first English version of the Old Testament made from the Greek. It has recently been reprinted: "The Old Covenant, commonly called the Old Testament: translated from the Septuagint. By Charles Thomson. A new edition by S. F. Pells," London (Skeffington), 1904, 2 vols. A "second issue," with the introductory matter increased from thirty-four to sixty-two pages, was "published by the Editor, Hove, England, 1907." Stamped on the cover of each volume are the words: "The Septuagint. The Bible used by our Saviour and the Apostles. Used in the Christian Church for a thousand years." In the Editor's preface we read (p. xi): "It was out of this version that our Saviour was taught when a child, and out of which He read in the synagogue the things concerning Himself (Luke iv. 18, 19)." A similar statement is repeated in the second issue, p. li: "The language of Christianity in Palestine was Greek, and the language of the Synagogue was Greek. When our Saviour 'stood up for to read' in the synagogue of Nazareth, it was from the Greek Septuagint, Luke iv. 16-21 (not Hebrew); the ordinary speech of the country at this period was Aramaic, or Syriac." The inscription on the covers of the second issue is altered to read: "Used in the Churches of England for a thousand years," it being a fond delusion of Mr. Pells that the Bibles in use before the Reformation were derived from the Septuagint and therefore more authentic than our present translation from the Massoretic text!

Other English translations of the Septuagint are:—

(1) *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, according to the Vatican text*, translated into English, with the principal various readings of the Alexandrine copy, and a table of comparative chronology. By Sir L. C. L. Brenton. London, 1844, 2 vols.

myself, ought to be mentioned here, although the assertion in the preface to the new edition that the Septuagint was the Bible used by Christ is not correct.

The Bible that our Lord used was a Semitic Bible. Paul, however, a child of Hellenized Judaism, used the Septuagint, and with him and after him Greek Christianity, before ever there was a New Testament, revered the Septuagint as the Bible and made it more and more a possession of its own. It has served the Christian Church of Anatolia in unbroken continuity down to the present day. It is peculiarly moving to a Bible student of our own days when, in a remote island of the Cyclades, he passes from the glaring noonday sunshine into the darkness of a little Greek chapel and finds the intercessory prayers of the Septuagint Psalms still as living on the lips of a Greek priest as they were two thousand years ago in the synagogues of Alexandria and Delos.

One who has experienced that will return with new devotion to the Book of the Seventy, strengthened in the conviction that this monument of a world-wide religion is indeed worthy of thorough and profound investigation on all sides, not only because of its Hebrew original but also for its own sake.

ADOLF DEISSMANN.

(2) *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, with an English translation ; and with various readings and critical notes.* London (S. Bagster) [1870]. Reissue, 1879. pp. vi., 1130 + 4 pp. Appendix ; Apocrypha pagged separately, iv. 248.

*SPEAKING AGAINST THE SON OF MAN AND
BLASPHEMING THE SPIRIT*

MARK III. 20-35; MATT. XII. 22-32.

THE difficulties, both historical and exegetical, which gather round this passage in the Gospel are only too well known. It is difficult to be sure of what precisely Jesus said ; and after we have convinced ourselves that one form of words takes us nearer to Him than another, it is difficult to be sure of what precisely those words mean.

The narrative of Mark is on the surface the simplest, and it seems to hang well together. Jesus is in a house, but attended by a crowd so large and so importunate that He has no opportunity even to take food. The impression made by the narrative is that others, not He, saw the situation in this light. He was absorbed in his work ; He lived in it with the refreshing abandonment of self in which He exclaimed on another occasion, "I have meat to eat that ye know not of" (John iv. 32). Those, however, who did not share this rapture could not be expected to understand it, and it is not astonishing to read that His friends apprehended he was losing self-control. They felt that if He could not take care of Himself it fell to them to take care of Him, and they set out to do it with kindly violence. "He is crazy," they said ; "He has lost His senses." This was not the only comment made on the rapt intense mood in which Jesus pursued His work. There were scribes from Jerusalem present who made a more sinister comment. They said, "He has Beelzebub ; it is by the prince of the demons that He casts out the demons." It is plain from the second part of this cruel saying that the work in which Jesus had so lost Himself was in part at least the work of expelling evil spirits. Probably the tradition of Christian art, to which the countenance of Jesus, whether pensive

or majestic or compassionate, is always in repose, tends to mislead our minds here. If we can judge by the indications in the Gospels, the Spirit that was in Him reacted with intense vehemence against the delusions and degradations of the possessed; the Evangelists give emphasis to the peremptory and commanding words with which He delivered them. If there had not been a visible strain and excitement in such miracles it would never have occurred to His friends to say he was beside Himself, or to His enemies to say He was possessed. It is the accusing comment of the scribes that Jesus goes on to answer in Mark iii. 23 ff., and it is at the close of His confutation of these adversaries that the solemn utterance stands which has occasioned so much discussion. "Verily I say unto you, all their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme; but whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin: because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." This is the form of Jesus' saying to which Wellhausen, for example, gives the preference. The point to notice in it is the absence of any reference to the Son of Man. On this view, the difficulty of the interpreter is not to distinguish between speaking against the Son of Man and speaking against the Spirit; but between sin and blasphemy generally, and blasphemy against the Spirit in particular. No doubt this simplifies the situation considerably, but there are two considerations which excite misgiving. First, if this is the true form of Jesus' saying, how did the other, in which the contrast between the Son of Man and the Spirit is the point on which everything turns, ever come into being? And second, how are we to explain the occurrence here in Mark of an expression unexampled elsewhere—"the sons of men"? It may be said that in a solemn utterance like this the language of Jesus rises involuntarily to a poetic level;

but is it not more probable, when we look to the parallel in Matthew, that we have a trace here of a misread original which said something about *the Son of Man*? Mark seems to have intended his readers to take the verses which immediately follow (Mark iii. 31–35) as the sequel to iii. 20 f. The friends who had gone out to lay hold on Him had arrived while this discussion was going on. They were, as we now learn, His mother and His brothers; and it is in the same mood of intense and elevated feeling which pervades the whole passage that Jesus repels their intrusion. Though the point of the sword pierced his mother's heart with the word, He could not but say it: "Who is my mother, and who are my brothers? Whoso doeth the will of God, the same is my brother and sister and mother."

In Matthew, we have no definite scenery as in Mark, but the Evangelist starts with such a case of exorcism as Mark only implies. Jesus heals a man possessed with a devil, blind and dumb. The crowds are profoundly impressed. Can this, they say, be the Son of David, the great deliverer whom God has promised to send His people?

Then the Pharisees—who can be practically identified with the scribes—make the same dark insinuation as in Mark, and are answered by the same arguments and illustrations. But at the close there is a difference. A verse is inserted to which Mark has no parallel. "He that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth" (Matt. xii. 30). This sounds like a warning against moral neutrality, yet who can suppose at this stage in the history that the scribes and Pharisees were neutrals in relation to Jesus? It requires some ingenuity to construe *v.* 31, in which the saying about blasphemy begins, as though it were closely connected with this. "Therefore—that is, in order that you may avoid the terrible peril involved in neutrality—I say unto you, Every sin and

blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men ; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven." Discounting the connexion, however, this is in import exactly what we have in Mark, and the first Evangelist, we know, had the work of the second in his hands. But Matthew does not stop here. He adds in *v.* 32 : " And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man it shall be forgiven him ; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in that which is to come." When we compare Luke xii. 10, and remember parallel cases, it is evident that here we have a genuine doublet : Matthew has had the saying of Jesus transmitted to him in two forms—one, that which it has in Mark ; the other, that which is also preserved in Luke ; and in his own Gospel he has inserted both, one in *v.* 31, the other in *v.* 32. Which was used by Jesus on this occasion ?

It has been mentioned above that Wellhausen prefers the Marcan form = Matthew xii. 31. As he interprets it, this yields a true and impressive meaning. Blasphemy is the reviling of God, and even blasphemy can find forgiveness—in the case of Job, for example, when God hides Himself and proceeds in incomprehensible ways. But blasphemy against the Spirit cannot be forgiven, for the Spirit—by which we must not understand anything merely moral—is the finger of God (Luke xi. 20, Matt. xii. 28) extended from behind the veil ; it is His personalized power living and moving upon earth and announcing itself unmistakably to men, whether through impersonal effects or through men of the spirit and of power. The expulsion of demons is a work of the Spirit ; he who pronounces it a work of Satan reviles the Spirit and is guilty of eternal sin (Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Marci*, 28). True though this is, it may fairly be questioned whether the distinction on which it turns between blaspheming God when He hides Himself and blaspheming God when

He reveals Himself through His Spirit would have occurred to a hearer of Jesus ; and besides the considerations alluded to above, there are others which may induce us to think that the report in which the Son of Man is contrasted with the Spirit is probably truer to our Lord's words on the occasion. We do not, with J. Weiss, need to argue, from his peculiar phrase " the sons of men," that Mark himself knew the saying in this form, but shrank from " the large-hearted word " which left forgiveness open even to him who spoke against the Son of Man ; some undiscoverable accident of transmission or translation, for which he had no responsibility, may have given it to him in the form in which we find it in his Gospel. But there is something in the idea of Schmiedel, who makes it one of the five foundation pillars of a historical account of Jesus, that it could never have been invented by a Christian to whom Jesus was an object of worship. Such a worshipper would never have imagined an indulgence for reviling his Lord, and the presumption therefore is that this singular saying goes back to Jesus Himself. What, then, does it mean ?

Up to the present hour, interpreters seem to be radically divided. J. Weiss, in his commentary on the Gospels in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, finds the key, following Wellhausen, in a distinction drawn between Jesus as a private person, and the power of God working in and through Him. He was intensely conscious, we must suppose, that this power was not His own, but God's ; it was something in the fullest sense of the word Divine ; it filled Him with awe as well as joy to contemplate the mighty works of redemption which it wrought ; He adored the love and omnipotence of the Father in it ; to blaspheme it was inconceivable, irreparable guilt. Men might say what they pleased about Jesus as a private person—little He recked of that ; but no warning was too solemn to be

addressed to those who reviled the power with which God wrought in Him to redeem men from the devil. There is an impressive truth in this, but there are two points at which it fails to satisfy the situation. If Jesus wished to speak of Himself as a private person, surely the Son of Man was of all designations the least appropriate for the purpose. It is a title which, as Holtzmann says, is relative to the Kingdom of God, exactly as the Son is relative to the Father. It describes Jesus not as a private person but specifically and definitely in His unique vocation. And further, when this is realized, we see that to speak a word against the Son of Man is not to be regarded as a trifle, about which He does not care, and we need not; the sense is rather that, serious as it is, such a sin may nevertheless find forgiveness, while there is a more deadly sin for which forgiveness is impossible.

Zahn, in his learned commentary on Matthew, follows another line, and contrives to make an apology for the Pharisees. He points out that there was much in Jesus which it was really difficult for men like them to understand; their critical misgivings, usually expressed in interrogative form, were very intelligible (Matt. ix. 3, 11; xii. 2, 10); they had not given any violent utterance to their growing bitterness; when they took counsel against Him it was in private (xii. 14), and the odious suggestion of Beelzebub, though it was aimed at Him, is not in Matthew (xii. 24) addressed to Him. Besides, according to Zahn, it was not really so bad as it sounds in our ears. Even such great and honoured persons as Abraham and Solomon were reputed to have held intercourse with evil spirits and to have practised magic arts; and all the Pharisees do here is to insinuate that a man like Jesus, who as an open violator of the law could not have the help of God, must do His mighty works, the beneficent and laudable character of which they do not

question, by the help of similar doubtful allies. The Pharisees are not committed against Jesus by what they say ; they are in a position of neutrality (xii. 30), and it is in view of its dangers that Jesus speaks (*διὰ τοῦτο*, xii. 31). The writer confesses that he finds it difficult to take this quite seriously. It affords no explanation of the contrast between the Son of Man and the Spirit. It does no justice to the attitude of the Pharisees to Jesus, which, in spite of *v.* 30, was as far as possible from being one of moral neutrality. It does no justice to the malignant reference to the prince of the demons. Least of all does it do justice to the extraordinary emphasis and solemnity of the words of Jesus.

Every writer, of course, writes to be understood without external aid ; but is it too bold to suggest that in reproducing the tremendous saying of Jesus and its setting each of the Evangelists has omitted something, and that we can only reach the mind of the Lord by combining them—though combination was never within their view ? The result would be somewhat as follows. Two kinds of sin are presented to us in Matthew, who is now assumed to give the true form of Jesus' words. Both are sins of the tongue, and both perhaps might be described as blasphemy. But though Matthew mentions both, he does not illustrate both. If we had to explain from his Gospel alone what is meant by speaking a word against the Son of Man, we should be left to conjecture, and, as the specimens of interpretation given above show, to very precarious conjecture. Mark, on the other hand, though he does not present us with the contrast of the Son of Man and the Spirit, does present us with the illustrations, in speech, which enable us to understand and apply it. The petulant exclamation of the friends of Jesus, as they see how He is lost in the sublime excitement of His work, "He is beside Himself"—here we have the type of a word spoken against the Son of Man ; the malign-

nant utterance of the scribes when they see Him relieve the possessed—"He has Beelzebub ; in the prince of the demons He casts out demons"—here we have the type of a word spoken against the Spirit. How would this reading of all our evidence work out ?

It seems to the writer to yield an appropriate and intelligible application. Jesus, even where the pardonable sin is concerned, is not regarded as a private person ; He is never a private person in the pages of the Gospels ; He is the Son of Man absorbed in His vocation. In such a life as His there must have been much that was baffling to those who were around Him. If there were a son or a brother under our roof to whom the one thing real was the Kingdom of God, who broke every earthly tie to give himself completely to it, who spent whole nights on the hillside in prayer to God over it, who was so absorbed in it that he could not find time for his necessary food, should we not be tempted to think that he required restraint ? Of course the friends of Jesus ought to have had greater sympathy with Him, greater appreciation of His work. They ought not to have made it possible for Him to say with the bitter accent of experience, "A man's foes are they of his own household." This was their sin. It was a real and a great sin, but not hopeless or unpardonable. Their hearts were not committed against Him, they were not deliberately and malignantly opposed to His work. Their petulant exclamation, gravely wrong as it was when we consider its object, was nevertheless impatient rather than deeply vicious. It was something they could be sorry for afterwards ; they would repent, and it would be forgiven.

It is difficult for one who hears or reads much of the endless discussion of Jesus going on around us to avoid the impression that speaking a word against the Son of Man is in this sense a common sin. Perhaps there never was a

time when the Gospels were so much read as at present. It is as though Jesus were surrounded by multitudes as dense and as interested as those which thronged Him in Galilee. They feel quite at liberty, too, to express their opinions about Him, and often—which is the point in the Gospel narrative—they do it with no sense of what He is and what they themselves are. They make their comments unembarrassed by any perception of the fact that Jesus is not a private person like themselves, but the Lord; and that in the last resort it is not we who judge Him, but He who judges us. What is called the purely historical study of the Gospels—as if there could be any such thing where the personality of Jesus is involved—is apt to betray into this wrong attitude even those who know better; and when it proves too strong for them, men speak of Jesus in a tone which is painful to Christian feeling, inadequate to the realities with which their words deal, injurious, in short, to the Son of Man. This is not a sin of no consequence because it is pardonable; it is pardonable on the same condition as other sins, that it be repented, confessed and renounced. To cultivate reverent forms of speech where there is no reverence felt would be a doubtful gain; we know how odious religious etiquette can be, and how insincere. But it is a Christian duty to cherish a reverent sense of the greatness of Jesus, and so to look at and listen to Him, so to love, trust and obey Him, that the sense of what He is may always rest on our hearts, and keep us from all that is irreverent in thought or petulant and disrespectful in speech.

When we turn to the word spoken against the Spirit, we have to recall the circumstances. Jesus had healed a demoniac, and the multitude were deeply impressed. What is more, He Himself was deeply impressed. He was conscious that the power which He exercised in restoring these dread-

fully afflicted creatures was power which the Father had given Him. It was the supreme token that God was visiting the world to deliver it from the evil one (Matt. xii. 28). It does not matter whether a first century form of thought, that of possession ; or a twentieth century one, which would speak of some kind of insanity, is used to present the facts to the mind : the facts themselves are indubitable. A power was present in Jesus and wrought through Him, bringing health to disordered minds, control to shattered nerves, purity to unnatural imaginations, God and his peace and joy to lost and terror-stricken souls. If we may say so with reverence, it filled Jesus Himself with devout joy. It filled the multitudes with undefinable hope : " Can this be the Son of David ? " But the scribes who came down from Jerusalem said, " He has Beelzebub."

To understand this, we must remember it was not the first but the final word of the scribes about Jesus. The earlier part of Mark's Gospel gives a series of occasions on which they came into collision with Him and His circle. They were perpetually finding fault. " Why do Thy disciples fast not ? Why do they on the Sabbath day that which is not lawful ? Why doth this man speak thus ? He blasphemeth." The more they saw of Jesus the less they liked Him. Their aversion deepened into antipathy, and their antipathy into a settled malignant hatred. Mark has already told of a plot to destroy Him (iii. 6). With His wonderful works of mercy under their eyes, with a power at work in Him which its effects proved indisputably to be the gracious and redeeming power of God, they hardened their hearts and said " Beelzebub." It was not the exclamation of men who were irritated at the moment, and forgot themselves, so to speak ; it was the deliberate and settled malice of men who would say anything and do anything rather than yield to the appeal of the good Spirit of God in Jesus. This is

the blasphemy against the Spirit which Jesus pronounces unpardonable. He calls it eternal sin. It is sin which, look at it as long as you will, is never altered or transmuted by repentance ; and therefore it has no forgiveness, neither in this world nor in that which is to come.

If this is the true reading of the facts, it is clear that this fatal sin is not one which can be committed inadvertently, and that sensitive consciences which have been tormented with the fear that in some hasty but irretrievable word or deed they had put themselves forever beyond the reach of grace, have misconceived the situation. It may rather occur to some that the sin of which Jesus speaks with such solemnity is one which we can hardly conceive as being committed at all. But if we consider its nature, as distinct from the particular form in which it was committed by the scribes, this may well seem doubtful. The scribes were confronted by the appeal of God's goodness in Jesus, and rather than yield to it they contrived a hideous explanation which should render it impotent. Is this so very uncommon ? Is it not common enough for men who are annoyed or reproved by the good deeds of others to ascribe such deeds to unworthy motives, so as to relieve the pressure with which they would otherwise bear on their own consciences ? This is in essence the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. It is the sin of those who find out bad motives for good actions, so that goodness may be discredited, and its appeal perish, and they themselves live on undisturbed by its power. To take the simplest kind of illustration : when a selfish or mean man is confronted with the generosity of another, there is a natural reaction of conscience. It is a reaction of admiration. Conscience tells him instinctively that such generosity is good ; it is inspired of God : it is God's appeal to him to be generous. But he does not want to be generous, and he is not scrupulous about protecting himself against the

Divine appeal. He hints at ostentation in his neighbour, or the love of praise ; he suggests ambition, or the desire to have an ascendancy which is to be the reward of the apparently generous act ; and the generosity itself is perverted or denied. This, let us repeat, is in essence the sin against the Holy Spirit. When this temper is indulged, and has had its perfect work—when it has become malignant and virulent, as in the case of the scribes—who can tell where hope lies for human nature ? There is nothing in the Gospels, or in the whole appearance of Jesus, to encourage easy optimism on this subject ; on the contrary, the possibilities of badness which this temper disclosed in human beings evidently filled Him with awe. Can we be sure the people are few who in the bottom of their hearts regard the life which Jesus lived and through which God appeals to them as no better than downright madness—a kind of life against which they are finally resolved to defend themselves without scruple as to their weapons ? It is a sin that has a course, and is not consummated in an instant ; but that men are doing every day what is morally of a piece with what the scribes did whose impiety moved Jesus so profoundly no one with eyes to see dare question. The securities against it are two. The first is, as in every sin, to withstand the beginnings—not to be suspicious of goodness in others ; not to be slow to believe in it, or quick to put an evil construction upon it ; to speak no slander, nor listen to it. The other is to rejoice in the work of Jesus. It is the chief of all our happiness and security in the world that we do not become insensible to His presence and power among men, that we open our nature freely and joyfully to the impression of it, and to the measure of our resources become fellow-workers with Him. If we know what is being done in His Spirit and power—if we rejoice in it, promote it, give God thanks for it—the sin against the Spirit is one that need not make us afraid.

JAMES DENNEY.

A STUDY IN ST. JOHN XXI.

THIS chapter is an appendix to the Gospel ; in this there is a general agreement ; beyond it, there is a large field open to the opinions of different scholars, and some of these opinions have an important bearing not only on the chapter itself, but on the whole Johannine problem, and its relation to other problems in the New Testament.

The style presents certain difficulties. On the one hand, there are distinct points of agreement with the Johannine phrases in the Gospel. Among these are the words :— λέγει οὖν (v. 5), ὡς ἀπὸ (v. 8), ὁ ψάριον (v. 9), πάλιν δεύτερον (v. 12), ἀμὴν ἀμὴν (v. 18), τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν σημαίνων (v. 19), περὶ τούτων and ταῦτα (v. 24) in their special relation to the word of witness. These points of contact are noted by Alford and are among the grounds on which he assigns the chapter to John himself : “ On the whole, I am persuaded that in this chapter we have a fragment, both authentic and genuine, added, for reasons apparent on the face of it, by the Apostle himself, bearing evidence of his hand, but in a ‘ second manner ’—a later style.”¹

But there are other phrases which show points of difference. The ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτόν is mainly used of our Lord’s appearances by the author of St. Mark xvi. 12, 14, where it occurs in the passive. This word sums up the Resurrection Life in the Epistle of Barnabas² : διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ἧ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοῦς. It would seem to be a sub-apostolic expression for the events of the Resurrection Life, belonging to the first half of the second century.³ The conclusion of St. Mark has been ascribed on Armenian

¹ Alford, *Gk. Test.*, vol. iv., p. 922.

² Barn., *Ep.* xv. 9.

³ The Epistle of Barnabas is dated c. 130 by Harnack (*Chr.* i. 427).

tradition¹ to the presbyter Aristion, one of the disciples of the Lord at this period. This phrase has, therefore, analogies with the literature of the subapostolic age.

The use of ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης (v. 1) contrasts with the Johannine use of ἐπί with the dative (iv. 6, v. 2). The phrase “οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου” occurs nowhere else in the Gospel. It is derived from the Synoptic Gospels. τολμᾶν and ἐξετάζειν are absent from St. John. The latter word only occurs in St. Matthew.

There is a reminiscence of the Synoptic phrase in St. Matthew xxii. 46, “οὐδὲ ἐτόλμησέν τις . . . ἐπερωτῆσαι. The expression τοὺς ἀδελφούς has no parallel in the phraseology of the Four Gospels. It has high Apostolic authority, and was a favourite expression of the Church in the second and third centuries.²

The argument from style does not therefore go very far. It is on the whole Johannine, with some few points of difference which show a different hand. It is almost certainly the work of one who was a master in the Johannine thought and style, and yet probably not to be identified with the writer of the Gospel.

The arguments from the contents of the chapter are more far-reaching. But even these are to some extent determined by the weight attached to the conservative or the critical standpoint from which they may be examined. The conservative view is tenable, that St. John, having completed the Gospel, wrote this appendix to describe the circumstances leading up to the solemn charge to St. Peter, and the prophecy concerning the manner of his death. At the same time it was an opportunity for denying the strange story concerning himself. Westcott indeed regards this as the actual motive of the appendix: “The occasion

¹ Conybeare, *EXPOSITOR*, 1893, 2, pp. 241-254.

² Harnack, *Mission.*, p. 290.

of the addition is probably to be found in the circulation of the saying of the Lord as to St. John (xxi. 23). The clear exposition of this saying carried with it naturally a recital of the circumstances under which it was spoken.”¹ But this seems to reverse the importance of the incident. The central feature of the chapter is the pastoral charge to St. Peter. The fishing leads up to it, the reference to St. John flows off from it. What has been said of the second half of the chapter seems certainly true of the whole: “The purpose of the second half of the chapter is to bring the dignity of Peter into somewhat greater prominence than it had received in the Gospel. The unnamed disciple indeed is always placed even higher than he; but the purpose of rehabilitating Peter is plain. This circumstance also makes against the identity of the author of this chapter with the author of the rest of the book.”²

This purpose seems to be strengthened by the character of the narrative. St. John, according to general testimony, is referred to again and again in the Gospel as “the disciple whom Jesus loved”: ὁ μαθητῆς ἐκεῖνος ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς. This phrase occurs not only in xxi. 7, 20, but in xiii. 23, xix. 26. In xx. 2 the phrase is: ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Is it therefore not probable that the test of love applied to St. Peter in the three-fold question: “ἀγαπᾷς με; ἀγαπᾷς με; φιλεῖς με;” is closely connected with this traditional prerogative of St. John. It is this prerogative which in the Gospel gives the pre-eminence to St. John in the Apostolic body. Without diminishing this prerogative, the writer of this chapter gives St. Peter a share in this same prerogative, and thereby raises him up to the same level as St. John. The answers given by St. Peter give evidence to the reality and the intensity of his love, and consequently

¹ Westcott, *St. John ad loc.*, chap. xxi.

² *Encycl. Bibl.* p. 2543.

to his special fitness for the great charge conferred upon him. Such a desire to bring St. Peter to at least a level with St. John would be strong in any Church in Asia which had inherited or assimilated strong Petrine traditions.

It has been suggested that the Montanist Churches in Phrygia recognized such a pre-eminence in St. Peter.¹ These Churches were largely Jewish. It was in the neighbourhood of the Jewish centres of population—Eumeneia, Apameia, Alcmeneia, that the centres of the Montanist movement are found. “Pepouza lies to the west of Eumeneia; Hierapolis and Otrous lie to the north-east of Eumeneia, higher up the Glaucus river; Ardeban, the birthplace of Montanus, was in Phrygian Mysia, and is identified by Ramsay with Kallataba, west of Pepouza.”² It was at Pepouza that the New Jerusalem was founded as the centre of a new religious movement. It was in Phrygia that St. Paul criticized the proneness of the Galatians to Judaizing influences. It is there that he speaks of St. Peter as entrusted with the Apostleship of the Circumcision (Gal. ii. 8). The Christian Jews of Phrygia would therefore be quick to recognize the apostolic authority of St. Peter, and the more so if, on other grounds, they were being treated as separatist churches. It is for this reason that there are grounds for thinking that Montanism was in fact a Jewish-Christian reaction against the Gentile Christianity of the Church. It has been already suggested that the two Epistles of St. Peter in their present shape belong to the Montanist circle of Themison of Pepouza.³ Is the appendix to the Gospel of St. John an earlier example of the same desire to give prominence to the Apostle of the Circumcision?

There are reasons for thinking that this is so. It has

¹ EXPOSITOR, July 1903, p. 59.

² Ibid., p. 58.

³ EXPOSITOR, July 1903, pp. 40-62; May 1904, 369-392.

been said that "the Fourth Gospel shows an indubitable contact with Montanism in the idea of the Paraclete."¹ This idea is further developed in Montanism than in the Gospel. The rise of Montanism is placed in the year 156. The new prophecy gave a new impulse to the study of the Johannine writings, and this in its turn brought about the attack not only on the Montanists but on the genuineness of the Johannine writings by the Alogoi c. 165.² Harnack remarks: "The Alogoi arose in opposition to the Montanists. Can it be that about the year 175-180 Catholic Christians began their attack on the Johannine writing?"³ The Montanists appear therefore as the upholders of the Johannine traditions. The Church even in Rome had its doubts. Gaius of Rome was an orthodox writer of very great learning.⁴ He wrote a dialogue against Proclus a Montanist. He also attacked the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel. On this occasion Hippolytus, himself perhaps a bishop with Montanist affinities, stood up in defence of St. John. This was about the year 222.⁵ So widespread was the hesitation of the Church as to the authority of the Gospel, perhaps in part due to the favour shown it by the Montanists, that a prominent writer of the Roman Church as late as the first quarter of the third century could be reckoned among its critics and opponents.

Has chapter xxi. of the Gospel any reference to this controversy? Is there anything in it which would imply that it was due to the work of some Montanist writer not only to give authority to the pre-eminence held by St. Peter in the Montanist Church, but also to strengthen the witness in favour of the genuineness of the Gospel. The Montanists

¹ *Encycl. Bibl.*, p. 2551.

² *Harn. Chron.* i. 379.

³ *Ibid.* note.

⁴ *Eus. H.E.* ii. 25. 6, vi. 20. 3.

⁵ *Encycl. Bibl.*, p. 1824.

appear between 156 and 225 as the defenders of the Gospel. Is it not probable that they would issue some form of attestation to strengthen its position in the Church ?

The Montanists were noted for their boldness in prophecy, and Themison is distinctly accused of writing, "in imitation of the Apostle, a certain catholic epistle to instruct those whose faith was better than his own, contending for words of empty sound, and blaspheming against the Lord and the Apostles and the Holy Church."¹ This charge is coloured by the strong bias of the anti-Montanist writer. But it proves that the Montanists put little restraint on their boldness in the vindication of their spiritual privileges. Reasons have been given in a former paper² to show that the Epistles of St. Peter may be regarded as catholic epistles of Themison. If they were bold enough to write in imitation of the Apostles, if they boldly dramatized the eye-witness of St. Peter on the Mount of Transfiguration (2 Pet. i. 17), they would not hesitate to do the same with regard to the fishing of St. Peter.

The prophecy on the martyrdom of St. Peter in *v.* 18 is thus an example of their practice of prophecy, and also of their boldness in dramatizing past events. It is the same in reference to the early belief that St. John would not die. Both are referred to, one as a martyrdom known to all (*v.* 19), the other as a rumour which needed contradiction (*v.* 23). And it has already been said that no stronger claim could be made on behalf of St. Peter than that involved in the three-fold test of love which brings the love of St. Peter on a level with the love of St. John.

Is it an accident that the Apostolic body is represented not as a group of twelve, but of seven ? Papias in giving his authority for the facts of our Lord's life gives the names

¹ *Apollonius ap. Eus. v. 18. 5.*

² EXPOSITOR, July 1903 ; May 1904.

of seven of the elders, and two of the disciples of the Lord. He allows that there was more than seven, but it is only seven whom he mentions by name. Were these seven identical in the list of St. John xxi. and in that of Papias? In St. John xxi. 2 the names are Simon Peter, Thomas called Didymus, Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, the sons of Zebedee, and two others. In Papias¹ the names are: Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, and Matthew. Resch identifies Nathanael with Matthew.² Are the two unnamed Apostles in this chapter Andrew and Philip? Such an identification agrees with the association of these two names in St. John xii. 22, and perhaps also in St. John i. 35-40.

The seven Apostles hold a prominent position in the Johannine Gospel, with the one exception of St. James. And early Church tradition represents their activity in the Churches of Asia Minor, and the countries adjacent to it.

The opening verse of the First Epistle of St. Peter is the earliest testimony, probably about the year 180,³ of the interest of St. Peter in the Church of Asia Minor. Origen says that "Peter seems to have preached to the Jews of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia."⁴ Edessa is the earliest field of the missionary labours of St. Thomas. Ambrose gives Persia as the missionary sphere of St. Matthew.⁵ St. John is associated with Asia. St. James, about whom the Gospel is silent, died before the Apostles were separated. St. Andrew is regarded as the Apostle of the Scythians; St. Philip, who in the early legends is identified with the Evangelist, is found throughout

¹ Pap. *Fragm.* iii. 4, ap. Patr. Ap. op. Gebh. Harn. Zahn, i.

² Resch. *Agrapha*, vol. iii. p. 829.

³ EXPOSITOR, July 1903, p. 61.

⁴ Comm. in Gen. *Encycl. Bibl.*, p. 4590.

⁵ S. Ambr. *in Ps.* xxv. 21.

Asia. These seven Apostles may therefore be regarded as the founders of the Churches of the nations immediately in touch with Phrygia.

This mission to the Gentiles is represented by the Fishing of the Seven. The narrative seems to be based on that of the Fishing of St. Peter in St. Luke v. 1-11, with this significant touch representing the progress and success of the Church: "for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken." The earliest explanation of the mystic number 153 is found in Cyril of Alexandria. The 100 represents the fulness of the Gentiles, the 50 the remnant of Israel, the 3 the Holy Trinity to whose glory all alike are gathered.¹ Another interpretation of the same era is that of Augustine. 10 is the number of the law, 7 of the Spirit; thus 17 represents the fulness of the revelation of life. And the sum of the numbers from 1 to 17 is 153. Perhaps the latter, though more complicated, may be the true one, as representing a closer knowledge of the value of numbers. They probably represent some earlier tradition.

There is one other link which is of importance in this argument. The words of 2 Peter i. 14, "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me," seem to point to the prophecy in St. John xxi. 18, 19. If the Second Epistle of Peter is the Catholic Epistle of the Montanist Themison, the reference to this prophecy in St. John xxi. 18, 19 strengthens the suggestion that it was a Montanist addition to the Gospel.

The last two verses are the attestation of the Church. The words, "We know that his testimony is true," may refer to the whole Gospel; but the special reference is to the love of St. Peter and the great charge committed to his care. It is also a challenge to the adverse criticism of the Alogoi, who were at this period (160-170) depreciating the

¹ Cyr. Alex. *in loc. ap.* Westcott, *St. John.*

value of the Gospel, and attributing it to the heretic Cerinthus.

The theory of a Montanist origin for this chapter is only inconsistent with the conservative view, that it is by the hand of the writer of the Gospel, and that the writer is St. John himself. This was the position taken by Alford and Westcott, and it has been defended by the Warden of Keble in a recent article on "the historical character of the Fourth Gospel."¹ The conservative position is defended also by Dr. Drummond, Mr. Richmond, and in part by Dr. Lindsay.

But it agrees with either of the leading critical views of the origin of the Fourth Gospel. The moderate view is represented by the position of Harnack, who regards it as "the Gospel of John the Presbyter according to John the son of Zebedee,"² and dates it between 80 and 110. The advanced view is that of Professor Schmiedel. He fails to find any definite trace of the Gospel before 140. He thinks it possible to do justice therefore to its relations to early Gnosticism, though it cannot have been intended to meet the later developments of Valentinian Gnosticism.³ He therefore is tempted to find in *v.* 43 a reference to the rebellion of Barchochba: "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not; if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." This estimate of the permanent value of the Gospel and First Epistle is the estimate which the Montanists set on it, and the reason why they stood up in defence of it, even against the criticism of some who were in full communion with the Church "Both writings rendered an extraordinary service to their time by absorbing into Christianity as they did every element in the great spiritual tendencies of the age that was

¹ *Interpreter*, July 1907, p. 356.

² *Harn. Chron.* i. p. 677.

³ *Encycl. Bibl.*, pp. 2550-2557.

capable of being assimilated, and thus disarming their possible antagonism . . . Of supreme value, not only for that age, but for all time, is the full assurance of its faith in the truth of Christianity (iv. 14, viii. 31-32, 51, xvi. 33, 1. 7. v. 4). . . . Truth is not only seen ; it is done (iii. 21, 1. 7. i. 6). . . . The Johannine theology can claim the most universal and absolute acceptance for the highest which it has to offer, the place which it assigns to love. This is the central idea of the first Epistle (ii. 7-8, iii. 23, iv. 7-21), and equally central is the saying of the Gospel in xiii. 34-35, xv. 12." ¹ And Dr. Lock also has a final word for those who are not able to accept the historical character of the Gospel : " Yet if others cannot feel this confidence that they are in the presence of historic fact, still much remains, much that is spiritual, central, and vital, much of essential truth that comes with the sanction of the Church." ²

It was this essential truth, this spiritual element in the Gospel, which, having been the outcome of all that was best in the tradition and theology of the Johannine Churches of Asia, was taken up by the Montanists as being the truest expression of their own belief in the Person of Christ, and the sternness of His moral character, and attested by them in this appendix to the Gospel.

THOMAS BARNES.

¹ *Encycl. Bibl.* 2558-2560.

² *Interpreter*, July, 1907, p. 370.

THE BAPTIST AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

It is to the Fourth Gospel that we look for the clearing up of the mystery of the Baptist's vacillation which is recorded by the Synoptists. The explanation that the Baptist had lost faith in the Messiahship of Jesus because the method of Jesus did not correspond with his ideas of the Messiah is excluded, as Professor H. H. Wendt rightly observes (*Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 14). But there may, however, be another explanation. Much of the history and hopes of the Baptist is revealed in the saying reported in the Fourth Gospel: "He who sent me to baptize in water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and abiding on Him, He it is who baptizeth in the Holy Spirit" (i. 33). In the heart of that wild figure, whose earnestness was ever [at white heat, was treasured up a charge consisting of a message and a promise; and as he did not fail to trumpet forth the one, he did not cease to brood upon the other. This promise was his inspiration. The hope of some day leading to his baptism one who was to confer the spiritual baptism that could purify the heart, supported the reformer in his dark hour. The hope of "the Stronger" (ὁ ἰσχυρότερος) "whose shoes he is not worthy to bear" (Matt. iii. 11); "the latchet of whose shoes he is not worthy to stoop down and unloose" (Mark i. 8), and whose [drastic treatment of the wicked appealed to the soul of the Baptist, is recorded in the synoptic Gospels. It would appear that the expectation of the Messiah's coming, which was widely spread among all classes, was especially rife among the crowds who gathered round the Baptist; and this very fact, even if there was nothing else behind it, as we believe there was, would explain the Baptist's intense anticipation of Him who was to come

(Matt. xi. 3). But John, who perhaps alone of all the evangelists belonged to the inner circle of the Baptist's followers, knew more than others of this hope, and alone records its fulfilment. One day the herald of the spiritual kingdom in his rapt mood had led a stranger, who perhaps differed in no way from other men except in the air of peace that rested upon Him, to the waters. And as he raised Him up, suddenly the rays of the sun fell upon that tranquil face ; and in a moment of ecstasy the Baptist witnessed the realization of his dream. That was the supreme hour of his life. It was an opening of the heavens and the tranquil descent and the permanent abiding of the Spirit upon the man before him. It was as if a voice was heard proclaiming the coronation and consecration of the King in the words of the Psalmist. And the Baptist, thus apprised of His nature and mission, declares : " I have seen and I have borne my testimony that this is the Son of God " (i. 34). His soul is satisfied. And when he afterwards saw the stranger pass he said with a reference to his favourite prophecy of Isaiah, " Behold, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," and then proceeds to explain his previous predictions of the greater One who was to succeed him, whose shoes' latchet he was not worthy to loose (i. 27), which was uttered when as yet he knew Him not (i. 33). But now he has met and known Him and the memory and witness of that vision are his life. On the next day he is again standing with two of his disciples, and looking upon Jesus walking says, " Behold the Lamb of God," and his disciples followed the stranger.

" The Baptist," Canon Sanday remarks, " is represented as repeating his exclamation twice ; but on the second occasion the qualifying clause is dropped ; the words are only, ' Behold the Lamb of God ! ' Is it not possible that this, or something like it, is all that was actually spoken ? Per-

haps not so much even as this ; but in some way or other we may believe that the Baptist did, as a matter of fact, compare the figure approaching him to a lamb.”¹ But if we take into account the fact that the vision had been seen before that testimony, we cannot be without some assurance that language was uttered which was not only sufficiently strong to indicate the Messiahship of the stranger, but also to induce his own followers to leave him and follow that stranger. Words uttered on such an occasion which marked the new crisis or change in a man’s career would of necessity be emphatically spoken and indelibly inscribed on the memory. There is another point. That vision explains the greater grasp the Baptist had of the divinity of our Lord in the Fourth Gospel than that ascribed to him in the synoptic narrative. In the latter the Successor is his Master whose sandals he is all unworthy to carry ; while in the former He is also the Master whose shoes’ latchet he is not fit to loose ; but He is more, He is before him (i. 30), and therefore has superseded him ; He is “ the Son of God (i. 34), and He is “ the Lamb of God ” (i. 36). The synoptic utterances were made before that strange meeting, baptism and vision (“ I knew Him not,” he declares, i. 33), and the Johannine announcements after. This fact is more evident when one considers that the interest of the Fourth Evangelist is centred not in the *preaching* of the Baptist, which so engrossed the attention of the Synoptists that they described it in three different Greek words : κηρύσσων (Mark i. 4), παρακαλῶν, εὐηγγελίζετο (Luke iii. 18), but in the witness, ἡ μαρτυρία, of the Baptist to the Christ to which the Christ Himself appealed (v. 33), but regarding which He said, “ The witness which I have is greater than that of John.” Such testimony demonstrates the standpoint of the witness as after the event, when his

¹ *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 160.

prophecy or *εὐαγγέλιον* had passed into *μαρτύριον* (cf. Matt. xxiv. 14).

This witness was of such paramount importance in the eyes of the writer that the command to repent, the scathing address, "ye generation of vipers" (*γεννήματα ἔχιδνῶν*), and the grim parable of the tree and its fruit, which were repeated with telling force by the Master in the synoptic Gospels, found no place in this. But the mysterious language in which the Baptist described his relation to the Master as "the friend of the Bridegroom," the Old Testament image under which the relation between Yahveh and His people was represented, is repeated in iii. 29, because it was of the nature of witness, *μαρτυρία*.

The similarity between the speeches in which the Baptist gives his testimony and the discourses of Jesus in this Gospel may be due either to the fact that the Evangelist reproduced the Baptist's statements, which are of considerable length and are evidently summaries (i. 15-34; iii. 27-36), in the after-light of the revelation of the Word, and recast them in the form in which they reproduced the words of Jesus; or it may be that the genius of the Baptist's expression may have exercised a subtle influence upon the mind of the Evangelist, and caused him almost unconsciously to adopt his style of speech as he recorded the discourses of the Master. Neither of these explanations impugn the veracity of the author; they simply allow play for subjectivity. One reporter will give a more effective but not less reliable summary of a speech than another by expressing its fundamental ideas, of which he retains a vivid recollection, in a more graceful form. And when the speech is recalled through the mists and after the constant repetition of many years it is not improbable that it may contain expressions which were frequently on the speaker's own lips. The *λαλία* may be a variable quantity, while the *λόγος* remains constant.

From the very beginning of the Prologue we see traces of the indelible impression which the Baptist's testimony made upon the mind of the Evangelist—a testimony which was duly receiving fresh confirmation in his own religious experience, and which had induced him to make his own great venture of faith. Of that testimony to “the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world,” the keynote is the very same as that to which the chords of the Gospel are set—the manifestation of the Christ, “that He should be made manifest to Israel; therefore am I come baptizing with water” (John i. 31).

The Prologue is the independent work of the Evangelist, but in its lofty strain we catch no distant echo of the first utterance of the Baptist in this Gospel. Compare “the Word dwelt among us . . . full of grace and truth,” *πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας* (i. 15) of the Prologue with “grace and truth (*ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια*) came through Jesus Christ” (i. 17)² of the Baptist's utterance. Jesus is *ὁ μονογενής* in both passages. The echoes of the Baptist's witness go on resounding through all the labyrinths of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles in a manner that is ought but casual. “No man hath seen (*έώρακε*) God at any time; the only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him” (i. 18), saith the Baptist. “No man hath seen (*τεθέαται*) God at any time,” saith the Apostle in his first Epistle (iv. 12); and in chapter xiv. 7–10 of the Gospel the Master saith: “No man cometh unto the Father but by me. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also; and from henceforth ye know Him and have seen Him” . . . Philip saith unto Him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou, Shew us the Father?”

“Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away (ὁ αἴρων) the sin of the world (τοῦ κόσμου),” cried the Baptist (John i. 29); “And He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for (those of) the whole world (τοῦ κόσμου),” wrote the Apostle in his first letter (ii. 2); and also, “You know that He was manifested that He might take away (ἄρῃ) our sins, and no sin is in Him” (iii. 5).

The Baptist had employed the same word to describe his devout gaze upon the Master (τεθέαμαι, John i. 32), which the disciple used to express his thoughtful contemplation of Him whom the Father hath sent to be the Saviour of the world (τεθεάμεθα, 1 John iv. 14).

“That He should be made manifest (φανερωθῆ) to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing in water,” said the Baptist (John i. 31); “This beginning of signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested (ἐφανερώσε) His glory,” wrote the Apostle (John ii. 11); “And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God,” is the concluding sentence of the Baptist’s statement (John i. 34), which is re-echoed in the words of the Apostle’s first letter (iv. 14); “And we saw and bare record that the Father hath sent the Son.” In both passages the witness of man is represented as proceeding from the vision of God.

Turning to the second speech of the Baptist (John iii. 27–36), we have in verse 30, αὕτη οὖν ἡ χαρὰ ἣ ἐμὴ πεπλήρωται, “this my joy therefore has been fulfilled,” the original of the Apostle’s twice-repeated phrase, “that our joy may be full” (1 John i. 4; 2 John 12, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ᾗ πεπληρωμένη).

“He that cometh from above” (ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος, iii. 31) speaks to Nicodemus of the birth “from above” (ἄνωθεν, iii. 3). “He that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth, ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ; He that cometh from heaven is above all” (iii. 32), exclaimed the Baptist; “If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye

believe if I tell you of heavenly things ? ” (iii. 12), said Jesus to Nicodemus ; “ They are of the world, therefore they speak of the world ” (ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου λαλοῦσι), wrote the Apostle in his first letter (iv. 6).

“ And what he hath seen and heard that he testifieth, and no man receives his testimony, μαρτυρίαν,” are the Baptist’s words (iii. 32) ; “ Verily, verily I say unto thee, we speak that we do know; and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not our testimony,” are the Master’s to Nicodemus (iii. 11). And again He said, “ Why do you not recognize my speech (λαλίαν) ? Because ye are not able to hear my word (λόγον, viii. 43).

“ He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true,” said the Baptist (iii. 33). To this we have a parallel in the First Epistle (v. 10) : “ He that believeth on the Son of God hath the testimony in himself ; but he that believeth not hath made him a liar, because he believeth not in the testimony which God hath given of His Son.”

“ For He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God ” (τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ), are the Baptist’s words (iii. 34) ; “ My doctrine (διδαχή) is not mine, but His that sent me ” (vii. 16), and “ He who sent me is true, and what I heard from Him, these things I say unto the world ” (viii. 26), are the Master’s ; and “ Thou hast words (ῥήματα) of Eternal life,” are Peter’s (vi. 68).

“ For the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand,” was the witness of the Baptist (iii. 35) ; and Jesus said to the Jews, “ For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth Him all things that Himself doeth. . . . For as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself, and hath given Him authority (ἐξουσίαν) to execute judgment also ” (v. 20, 26). And again in His prayer (xvii. 2) He said, “ As Thou hast given Him authority (ἐξουσίαν) over all flesh.”

“The Father giveth not the Spirit *by measure* (ἐκ μέτρον) unto Him,” saith the Baptist (iii. 35). “He is *full* (πλήρης) of grace and truth,” wrote the Apostle in the Prologue (i. 14). “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life (ζωὴν αἰώνιον), and he that believeth not the Son shall not *see* (ὄψεται) life,” are the words of the Baptist (iii. 36); while, “Except a man be born from above he cannot see (οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν) the kingdom of God” (iii. 5); “He that believeth on Him may not perish, but have everlasting life” (ζωὴν αἰώνιον) (iii. 18); and “He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life” (vi. 47), are the words of Jesus; and “This is the testimony, that He hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son, hath not life,” are the words of the Apostle in 1 John v. 11. “The wrath of God abideth on him” (μένει ἐπ’ αὐτόν), said the Baptist of the unbeliever (iii. 36); and he likewise said of the Messiah, “I saw the Spirit descending as a dove from heaven, and it abode upon Him” (ἔμεινεν ἐπ’ αὐτόν, i. 32).

These resemblances between the Baptist’s evidential utterances and the form in which the Apostle cast the words of his Master and his own reflections are at once a proof of the relationship that existed between the Baptist and his disciples, and of the integrity of the Fourth Gospel. The statements of the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel differ, indeed, from the more popular forms of the Baptist’s testimony that are enshrined in the synoptic Gospels, but they preserve certain peculiarities of his prophetic style, the symbolic use of “Lamb” and “Bridegroom,” which do not reappear in this Gospel, and his curt and indirect manner of answering questions. It is, indeed, possible that the teaching of the Baptist, who found a congenial pupil in the mystic and enthusiastic John, gave a certain direction and stimulus to the theological mind of the other, and pre-

pared him for the fuller revelation of the Son of God. This would be in accordance with the angel's prediction to Zacharias that his son should go before the Lord "in the spirit and power of Elias" (Luke i. 15).

It was only in the greater and fuller light of the Christ that "the burning and shining lamp" (ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων (John v. 35) of the Baptist began to wane. It is no wonder that John, the man of vision, who reads the thoughts of men and interprets the purposes of God, and who rejoiced for a season in the light of the Baptist, should turn from the lesser light that ruled the night to the greater light that ruled the day of revelation; but as he turned he carried with him grateful memories of him who beheld the glory of Christ, and who bore a record that was indelibly fastened on his mind, and which may have unconsciously fashioned his mode of expression. And thus the Baptist's voice became in more than one sense the preparer of the way of the Lord.

In the Fourth Gospel, the work of a former disciple of the Baptist, we naturally find much to rehabilitate the Baptist in the opinions of men. Although he continued to baptize after Jesus had commenced His work, he still continued to testify of Jesus, so that many were prepared to receive the Christ. When the Baptist had been cast into prison, Jesus, who had left his vicinity in order to avoid collisions among their disciples, returned, and many came and said, "John did no sign, but everything that John said about this man was true. And many believed on Him there" (John x. 42). And while in the Synoptists the question, "Art Thou He that cometh, or look we for another?" (Matt. xi. 3) emanates from John Baptist as challenger, here the testimony to Jesus is evidently borne by John when challenged by the Jews: "Ye sent to John, and he bare witness to the truth" (v. 33).

This testimony of the Baptist to Christ occupies a prominent position in the Gospel. It was owing to his ever vivid impression of that witness that the author twice explains the course of the argument with which he begins his Gospel by a reference to this testimony. These passages, which, according to the partition theory of Dr. H. H. Wendt, are interruptions of the original prologue by the later Evangelist, are thus, to another view, interludes of human music in the divine anthem of the Word, necessary links in that great chain of reasoning which is gradually lowered from the heights of existence and light which no man can approach unto or describe, to the levels of human being and thought, until the Word illuminative and the Word creative stands revealed as an historical figure upon the stage of life. In its broad lines this witness is consistently represented in the four Gospels ; while its more special position in the economy of Christian revelation is given by him who alone of the Evangelists could gauge its value and estimate its influence, and whose writings can hardly be said to be actuated by " a polemical interest against the Baptist " (Wendt, *Johannes-evangelium*, p. 226).

So far is it from this being the case, that it seems most probable that the author of the Fourth Gospel was an intimate disciple of the Baptist. For it is noteworthy that in this Gospel—although it is essentially the Gospel of the Holy Spirit—a Gospel strange to the Ephesian followers of the Baptist (Acts xix. 4)—nothing that could in the slightest manner detract from the character and work of the Baptist finds a place. The writer paints him in a softer and more agreeable light and describes his relation to the Messiah as the constant witness of the True Light, perhaps, not so much with a view to prove that the Messianic nature of his successor was known to John as to re-establish the character of the Forerunner. It is the Synoptists that tell us of the

Baptist's vacillation and question, "Art Thou He that cometh, or look we for another?" (Matt. xi. 3). But it is the vision in the Fourth Gospel that explains both the exaltation of the Baptist's faith and its depression. After the two disciples have left his side he continues his work, and when some of his followers, after a discussion with a Jew about purifying, return to him and say, "Rabbi, He that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to Him," he expressed himself in words of resignation and pious reflection. But Jesus withdrew when it was known that His disciples were more numerous than John's, lest He should wound the latter's feelings. Shortly after this the Baptist is cast into prison; and from the soul of the caged prophet the vision he had received fades away. It had helped him to rise above the Jewish aspirations of his time; but within his prison walls the golden hope passes from his grasp. He longs for another revelation, a fresh assurance to fan into flame the dying embers of his faith. The vacillation of the Baptist is thus not "psychologically incomprehensible" (Wendt, *l.c.*, i. 14). For they who rise to the highest heights of hope are prone to sink to lower depths than those who have never soared at all. But it is not the prisoner with his fettered wing, than whom the least in the kingdom is greater, that the fourth Evangelist portrays, but the prophet on soaring pinion, with the gleam of a glorious vision upon his brow—a "man sent from God" and come for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men might believe through him (i. 6, 7), and concerning whom the people said, "John did no sign, but everything that John said *regarding this man* was true" (x. 41).

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

*DR. SANDAY'S CRITICISM OF RECENT
RESEARCH.*

A GOOD many years ago (I think in this Magazine) I expressed the opinion, forced on one who lived far from Oxford, that Dr. Sanday was to some degree giving up to a single University what was meant for mankind. This reproach—if that can be called reproach which was merely the recognition of a zealous and strict devotion to the immediate duty—can no longer be uttered in view of the books with which the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity has enriched us all in recent years. One perceives that these are the result of the long period of probation and preparation to which Dr. Sanday's work has been submitted. The marked characteristic of his writing is its maturity and fulness of thought rather than its ingenuity. His books derive their value, not from bold and brilliant views, which seem to carry both the writer and the reader away with them and almost to overmaster the judgment, but from the impression they convey of a reserve of power that lies still unused behind the written word, of a methodical toning down of expression to the standard that is inevitable and convincing. He never strikes one as speaking too strongly, but always as having pondered over the expression of each opinion till it is the last and completest word that has to be said from that point of view. There is no modern writer who more strongly impresses me with the sense of the moral element which is a necessary part of high intellectual power. It is a truth which one has often to impress on students at college, that mere cleverness is a poor and even a dangerous part of a scholar's equipment, adequate by itself only for the winning of entrance scholarships and class prizes but having no staying power in the race of life.

One feels in Dr. Sanday's work that it is founded and built up on the intense desire to reach the truth, and that this intense desire has directed the method, and concentrated the faculties in the path of knowledge.

The book is made up of a series of lectures and reviews which have no connexion with one another except in two very important respects, they all¹ belong to one stage and one period in the evolution of the Author's views, and they to a large extent spring from a single purpose, viz., to sum up and estimate some leading tendencies and results in the present stage of scholarship. That the various surveys which are taken of separate parts of the whole field were worked up to suit different occasions gives a superficial appearance of disjointedness; but the appearance is really only superficial, and might by slight changes have been in great measure eliminated, if there were anything to gain by eliminating it.

The opening chapter on the Symbolism of the Bible is a very simple expression of much careful thought: many problems have been pondered over for a long time before it was written, yet they hardly appear above the calm surface. On p. 14, as we see gladly, Dr. Sanday recognizes that "from the very first sacrifice was expressive of ideas." The use of the plural shows that he would not admit the explanation of the origin of the rite of sacrifice from a single idea, as some scholars would maintain. Sacrifice is the expression of the human mind in its relation to God, and is as various as the human mind. The thought of primitive man was simple, but it can never be reduced to one idea alone. The man who can explain the origin of sacrifice from one idea is perilously near the discovery

¹ Except I think the review of Dr. Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*, which (if I am not making a mistake) I remember to have seen some years ago.

of the key to all mythology, and he who has found that key is hopelessly lost. You can with sufficient ingenuity always explain—verbally—anything out of anything; and thus you can draw out—on paper—a process of development whereby all mythology and all sacrifice evolve themselves from a single origin; but this process has nothing firmer to rest upon than the paper on which it is written. Dr. Sanday's words might easily be taken as indicating the view that there are only two really primitive ideas in sacrifice, the gift and the sacrificial communion; but I think that this would be a misconception, and that, when he speaks of "two ideas that we can trace furthest," he does not intend to restrict the number to two, but merely expresses his conviction as to the reality and certainty of at least these two.

On the other hand I confess that I cannot entirely sympathize with the point of view expressed in the paragraph at the foot of p. 9: "We are not surprised to find that in the early books of the Bible, where dealings take place between God and man, the Godhead is represented under human form. Man was himself the noblest being with which he was acquainted; and therefore, in conceiving of a being still nobler, he necessarily started from his own self-consciousness; he began by magnifying his own qualities, and only by degrees did he learn, not only to magnify, but to discriminate between them."

This is, in a way, perfectly proper and sensible. It is what every one says—perhaps what every one must say—and yet I do not feel that it is vital or illuminative: it seems to leave out the true principle. I should not venture to attempt to define the true principle: the task is above my power. But I cannot recognize it in this statement, which is apt to suggest that the conceptions of the Divine nature current among the Hebrews began by being anthro-

pomorphic. This does not convince me. I should rather approach the problem from the point of view that the early Hebrew conceptions were undeveloped, vague, and capable of future growth in more than one direction. They might have degenerated into anthropomorphism, as the Greek conception did. They were equally capable of development in another direction; and they did in fact, under the impulse of a succession of prophets and thinkers, develop in a [nobler [and truer way. But how to describe the unformed germ of early Hebrew thought I know not: most of what Dr. Sanday says on this hard subject seems to be excellent, illuminative and suggestive; but not all.

Difficulties of various kinds impede the attempt to express oneself clearly on this subject. You cannot speak precisely about what is essentially vague. It is difficult to project oneself into the mind of primitive man, or to picture to oneself what was in his mind. It is also hard for us, who are accustomed to aim at clearness and precision and definite outlines, to sympathize with or understand the oriental expression which rather shrinks from these qualities and prefers the vague, the suggestive, and the indirect. The difference between the European and the Asiatic mind is, to a large degree, a mere matter of education lasting through generations and centuries, but perhaps it is to a certain extent due to difference of nature and sympathy and endowment.

I much prefer Dr. Sanday's other term "indirect description" to the term "symbolism" by which he more frequently designates the Hebrew and oriental style of expression.

The term "symbolism" which Dr. Sanday prefers as the least objectionable is open to the objection that the person who speaks symbolically is conscious of the difference

between the symbol and the real thing, and consciously employs the one to stand in place of the other. That is the case with the symbolic actions of the prophets, described in the first section of this opening chapter of the book which we are reviewing, as when Agabus took Paul's girdle and bound himself with it in token that Paul would be bound if he went to Jerusalem: the symbolism here was conscious and intended, and Agabus explained its meaning.

But, as the Author himself says on p. 11, the earlier Hebrews often did not regard the "symbol" as different from the thing symbolized: the "symbol" was the thing symbolized. How are we to understand or to describe a stage of thought when ideas are so vague and so unformed that they thus pass into one another without any consciousness of the transition? Take the genealogical fiction, which plays so important a part in the early history of many peoples, not merely of the Jews. It was not a fiction in primitive thought: it expressed a truth in the simplest and most direct manner in which the natural mind could express it, though to us the manner seems indirect. The Rev. Dr. White of Marsovan gives an admirable example that came within his own experience, where a wandering dervish used this mode of expression. "He told me that he was a Shukhbazari; and then, to enlighten my ignorance, explained that Arabs, Circassians and Shukhbazaris are 'own brothers, children of one father and one mother.' He used a Scripture form of expression to make me understand that the three peoples possessed the same traits of character." The dervish was merely eager to emphasize the close resemblance in character between the three peoples. He could think and speak only in concrete terms: he could not generalize or deal in abstractions. Yet out of his language in the process and hardening of thought there

might rise naturally and easily a genealogical fiction: the common father and mother acquire names, and the three peoples become three sons.

Nor is it merely real similarity of character that may give origin to this genealogical expression of history. Geographical contiguity may cause it, or the speaker may express by it little more than a common diversity from himself. He looks out over the world, and distinguishes from himself several peoples of the north-west as being children of one father different from his father. So in Genesis x. 4 we have "the sons of Javan: Elishah, and Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim."

The "genealogical fiction," then, has to be understood correctly, and it becomes valuable history. Only the unsympathetic and unintelligent historical criticism of forty or fifty years ago, the period of Grote and Cornewall Lewis, and the *Tübinger*, would be content to regard it simply as legend, and leave it out of the sphere of history. But, in order to understand aright any genealogical myth, we must put ourselves at the point of view of the person or people who originated that particular expression. It tells us something about the peoples whom it correlates to one another: it tells us more about the person or people who originated it: it tells us most of all about the standard and range of knowledge, the limits of geographical outlook, and so on, in the period when it took the form in which we have it.

But here lies the problem that is proposed to the modern student of ancient history. He must entirely dissociate himself from the accepted method of investigating the ancient documents—what is called the "critical" method. He must forget the modern division of the world into the "educated" and the "savage" races. He must separate the primitive man alike from the "educated" and the

“savages” of modern time; for men in the early stage were neither one nor the other, but contained the possibility of both.

In the second half of this most interesting chapter, Dr. Sanday proceeds to apply to the Gospels the inferences which he has drawn from the use of “symbolism” in the Old Testament. The discussion of the Temptation of Jesus occupies the largest space in this part, and is of peculiar interest to the present reviewer. The Temptation is in Dr. Sanday’s view entirely a parable (if I am not wholly misunderstanding him). His idea of the Temptation is expressed in the picture by W. Dyce—“a monotonous landscape and a Figure seated upon a stone, with the hands clasped, and an expression of intense thought on the beautiful but by no means effeminate features.” Not that he regards this as the only correct representation of the Temptation. As he says, “it would be a mistake if we were to insist too much upon this contrast [i.e., the contrast between the subjective modern view, and that of Tissot with a conventional fiend, or of mediaeval painters with every detail sharp and definite], as though the modern presentation were right and true, and the ancient or mediaeval wrong and untrue. Each is really right in its place: they mean fundamentally the same thing, and it is only the symbolical expression that is different.”

With Dr. Sanday’s view I find myself on the whole in thorough sympathy. That the story of the Temptation is largely of the nature of parable seems established by the Gospels themselves. I venture, as being the briefest way in which I can express my criticism of the present study, to quote part, and to abbreviate part, from what I once wrote on the subject, *The Education of Christ*, p. 31 f., “The authority obviously is the account given by Himself to His disciples; and we are told that ‘with-

out a parable spake He not to them.' How far the details partake of the nature of parable, intended to make transcendental truth intelligible to the simple fishermen, we cannot precisely tell, and no man ought to dogmatize. But no one can doubt as to the essential truth that lies under the narrative." Jesus counted the cost before He began His career: He thought of other possibilities, brilliant and tempting; and He rejected them as temptations. It is involved in the Temptation, when He described it to His disciples, that He was already conscious of the superhuman powers and opportunities that were His, if He chose to use them for personal ends. If you accept the story as anything beyond pure fiction, you must accept the superhuman consciousness of Him who was tempted by means such as are here brought to bear on Jesus. As a whole the temptations are meaningless and absurd, if applied to an ordinary man. It is mere trifling to say to an ordinary man who is hungry, "command that these stones become loaves."

If I understand Dr. Sanday rightly, there is nothing in this statement that would disagree with his views. The only word of question that I would make with regard to his expression of them, is whether in the desire to give clearness to his lecture (such was the original form of the first chapter), he has not made it in some parts too clear and sharp and definite in outline, too strongly modern in tone: though the quotation which I have extracted from his book attests his recognition of the fact that every age must and may look at the Temptation with different eyes, and all equally rightly.

Some may probably be afraid that Dr. Sanday's use of symbolism may, from his premises, be quite logically carried very far, much further than he carries it or they would like. But in an admirable concluding page he sums up the true attitude of mind and the right temper in which all historical

study ought to be carried on. With certain obvious modifications, what he says here is applicable to every department of ancient history. A certain sympathy for peoples and times and ideas remote from our own, an intense desire to comprehend them, a determined effort to throw off the fetters of nineteenth century views and to rise to a freer outlook, a contempt for narrow reasoning and hard logicity (which in these historical problems is often thoroughly illogical in the higher sense of the term logic), all these are needed in the reconstruction of ancient history and the interpretation of ancient literature. But hear how delicately and finely Dr. Sanday describes this attitude of mind : it " consists mainly in three things :

" 1. In a spirit of *reverence* for old ideas, which may perhaps be transcended, but which discharged a very important function in their day ;

" 2. In a spirit of *patience* which, because those ideas may be transcended, does not at once discard and renounce them, but seeks to extract their full significance ;

" 3. In an *open mind* for the real extent of this significance. We have our treasure, perhaps, in earthen vessels, but the vessels are themselves very deserving of study. I would say rather that, for the purpose before us, we should not think of them exactly as earthen, but as made of some finer and more transparent material which permits us to see through to the light within."

A survey of recent research would be an impertinent and valueless production if it were simply a cataloguing of faults and a statement of dissent. One is familiar with the criticism written by the able young man, whose rare and condescending recognition of merit is as a grain of wheat in a bushel of chaff, whose principal aim seems to be to show how much better he could have done the work, if he had cared to undertake it, than the author, and who has evi-

dently never made any serious attempt to understand the book which he criticizes, but merely touched it on the outside and gone off at a tangent. Criticism of this kind is *unerquicklich wie der Nebelwind*.

Totally different is the character of Dr. Sanday's work. He appreciates thoroughly the high principle that it is the function of true criticism to find excellences, not defects. He tells us what he finds that is good in each of the authors whom he criticizes; he expresses his dissent only where necessary to bring out the state of modern opinion; and he expresses it in very gentle and gracious terms. The sharpest statement of disapproval which I observe is that on p. 171; and yet how much it is qualified by preceding sentences of genuine hearty praise. I quote the whole passage. "I have a sincere respect, and even admiration, for perhaps five-sixths of his work,¹ including particularly—I should like to say in passing—his reviews of the literature of Patristics, in which he has been at once just and generous to some of my friends here in Oxford. I repeat that the pamphlet from which I started is not only good but in many ways very good. One may go on for wide stretches in his books and find only occasion to admire. And yet every now and then one is pulled up sharp by passages like those of which I have been speaking, which, I confess, move me to indignation, so narrow are they, and so hard, so deficient in sympathy and in intelligence for the difference between one age and another."

A quality in Dr. Sanday which strikes me as peculiarly admirable—perhaps because I lack it too much—is his power of learning from writers who are so antipathetic to him. If a commentator is devoid of sympathy for the

¹ In the case of reviews, I have often observed that the author is as a rule not so much gratified by the five-sixths of approval (however laudatory) as he is annoyed by the one-sixth of disapproval. It is the same if the proportions are eleven-twelfths and one-twelfth.

ancient author about whom he is writing, or lacks insight into the more delicate and subtle aspects of the text which he is discussing, I can hardly force myself to read him ; he has nothing for me ; and I neither learn from him (except that he sometimes makes me understand through antagonism passages which I might otherwise have failed to comprehend) nor criticize him. But we have just seen how Dr. Sanday can respect and admire five-sixths of an author whose remaining sixth part moves him to indignation. Now let us see how he expresses himself about another writer, who “ has directness and ability, and never minces matters ; as I have said, he belongs to no school, and repeats the formulæ of no school. But he writes in the style of a Prussian official. He has all the arrogance of a certain kind of common sense. His mind is mathematical, with something of the stiffness of mathematics—a mind of the type which is supposed to ask of everything : What does it prove ? It is a mind that applies the standards to which it is accustomed with very little play of historical imagination. If it cannot at once see the connexion of cause and effect, it assumes that there is no connexion. It makes no allowance for deficiencies of knowledge, for scantiness of sources and scantiness of detail contained in the sources, for the very imperfect reconstruction of the background that alone is possible to us. If there is upon the surface some appearance of incoherence or inconsequence, it is at once inferred that there is real incoherence and inconsequence. And the narrative is straightway rejected as history ; though a little reflection would show that life is full of these seeming inconsistencies, and would be fuller still if our knowledge of the events going on around us did not supply us with the links of connexion which make them intelligible. Wrede argues as though we could exhaust the motives of the actors in events that happened nearly nineteen hundred years

ago, whereas nothing is more certain than that we cannot in the least come near exhausting them."

On one somewhat important matter I find myself, to my great regret, distinctly in opposition to my friend the Author (to whose counsel and help and never-failing encouragement I owe so much). He seems to me to estimate too highly the possibilities of discovery which purely literary criticism offers: while I seem to him to undervalue them. This is a question that requires more space than can here be given to it near the end of an article; but my impression is that the great and epoch-making steps in advance come from non-literary, external, objective discovery, and that the literary critics adopt these with admirable and praiseworthy facility as soon as the facts are established, and quickly forget that they themselves (or their predecessors) used to think otherwise, and would still be thinking otherwise, if new facts had not been supplied to them. Nothing gives me such interest, and so illustrates human nature, as to observe how principles of literary criticism of the Old Testament, which were accepted as self-evident when I was studying the subject under Robertson Smith's guidance about 1878, are now scorned and set aside as quite absurd and outworn by the modern literary critics. But it was not literary criticism that made the advance: it was hard external facts that turned the literary critics from their old path, and they have utterly forgotten how the change came about.

Moreover, it sometimes seems to my humble judgment that Dr. Sanday is unconsciously guided by the prepossession that there must be a certain residuum of truth in some clever treatise which he has been reading; and he finds this residuum by dividing the writer's total estimated result by 10 or by 100.

He finds the English scholars on the whole to be nearer

the truth, the Germans to be more educative and suggestive. I agree with him to a certain extent. I owe to the Germans almost all the stimulus of my early years, and I owe to several of them also almost all the encouragement which I received at the beginning when I needed it most, and for which I can never be sufficiently grateful to them. But now I find the English most useful, because they often give me facts without views, while the majority of the German writers start from a definite and fixed prejudice. They assume—many of them—the whole of the book in the opening paragraph; and often it seems as if one could draw out the whole reasoning in inexorable logic after reading the opening assumptions.

I must find room for another saying, which seems profoundly true and far too generally neglected. "The fact is that the Judaism of the time of Christ had a wider and more open horizon than that of a hundred years later. The result of the terrific and almost superhuman efforts that the Jews made to throw off the Roman yoke was a long reaction that has lasted almost to our own time. When the great effort failed, Judaism withdrew into its shell; it contracted its outlook and turned in upon itself. It gave up the hope of divine intervention that had at one time seemed so near, and was content to brood upon its past." Several times, in a quite different line, I have had to protest against the prejudice that the later Jewish customs and thought can be regarded as the norm according to which we must judge about Jewish practice and views in the first century before and after Christ. Dr. Sanday here states the true historical principle in a direct and uncompromising fashion; and the whole passage from which I have quoted a few words is as well worth study as anything in the whole space of these carefully thought-out lectures.

In the style one is often also struck by an apparently unconscious tendency to use military metaphors, to think like a soldier, and to count and marshal his thoughts as methodically as a general estimates and orders his force. Exactly five-sixths of Jülicher's work is good and even admirable. "The histories of Elijah and Elisha are much nearer—indeed quite near—to the events."

Other examples of similar character are :—

"Weinel's book is up to a good average, and Steinmann's perhaps somewhat above it" (p. 44).

"I welcome much of his criticism both on the right hand and on the left" (p. 44).

"With us dashing and desultory raids are apt to take the place of what is in Germany the steady disciplined advance of a regularly mobilized army" (p. 42).

"Whatever advance is made, is made all along the line" (p. 41).

Taken in conjunction with what is said in the opening paragraph of the present article, these extracts seem to be indicative of the methodical character of the Author's mind and the orderly progress of his studies. The development of a scholar is always an interesting study not only to other scholars, but probably to the world at large ; and this quality seems to lie at the basis of the Author's intellectual power. In this connexion I need make no apology for another observation, even though it may perhaps seem to some people to savour of a too personal scrutiny.

In this book which now lies before us I am struck with one difference, and, as I venture to think, improvement in the style from his earlier writings—I am not referring to English composition but to scientific exposition of opinion. Dr. Sanday uses the simple first person singular more frequently than he did in an earlier period of his work. This usage is not necessarily egotistic ; in scientific work

it is rarely egotistic; it is the briefest and most direct way of calling attention to the subjectivity, and therefore necessarily the uncertainty, of a statement: it is a danger flag, not a claim of ownership. When a view seems to be proved and trustworthy, one states it in the impersonal language of science; when it is advisable to call attention to the subjective element in a view, and to warn the reader that it is as yet only opinion (as one believes, true opinion), but not thoroughly reasoned and assured knowledge,¹ one uses the personal form.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ In Platonic language, it is ἀληθῆς δόξα, not ἐπιστήμη.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D., LL.D.	
The Martyr Apostles	233
The Disciple whom Jesus Loved	324
Rev. Thomas Barns, M.A.	
A Study in St. John xxi.	533
Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.	
The Authenticity and Originality of the First Gospel	339
F. C. Conybeare, M.A.	
The Newly Recovered Treatise of Irenaeus	35
S. A. Cook, M.A.	
The Jewish Temple of Yahu, God of the Heavens, at Syene	497
Late Professor Ernst Curtius.	
St. Paul in Athens	436
Rev. Professor Adolf Deissmann, D.D., D.Theol.	
The Philology of the Greek Bible	289
The Problem of "Biblical" Greek.	425
Septuagint Philology	506
Rev. Professor James Denney, D.D.	
Speaking Against the Son of Man and Blaspheming the Spirit.	521
Rev. Principal A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.	
The Risen Lord	1
The Restatement of the Gospel for To-day	385
Rev. F. Ll. Griffith, M.A.	
Note on the Elephantine Papyri	495

	PAGE
Rev. F. R. M. Hitchcock, M.A., B.D.	
The Dramatic Development of the Fourth Gospel	266
The Baptist and the Fourth Gospel	543
Rev. W. W. Holdsworth.	
Faith in the Fourth Gospel	182
Rev. Principal James Iverach, D.D.	
Pantheism	20
The Relation of God to the World	152
Rev. David M. M'Intyre, M.A.	
The Cloud of Unknowing	373
Rev. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, M.A., Phil.D.	
Christian Theology and Comparative Religion	208
Rev. Professor Robert Mackintosh, D.D.	
Marriage Problems at Corinth [#]	349
Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, M.A., Litt.D.	
The New Papyri of Elephantine	481
Rev. Newton H. Marshall, M.A., Phil.D.	
The Philosophical Method of the New Theology	87, 169
Rev. J. H. Michael, B.A.	
The Gift of Tongues at Corinth	252
Rev. James Moffatt, D.D.	
Literary Illustrations of the Book of Ecclesiasticus	279, 473
Rev. Professor J. H. Moulton, D.D.	
Synoptic Studies	45
W. B. Neatby, M.A.	
Mr. William Kelly as a Theologian	70
Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, M.A., B.D.	
The Demonology of the Old Testament, Illustrated by Psalms xci.	132

INDEX OF TEXTS

571

	PAGE
Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D., D.D.	
The Divine Child in Virgil	97
A Christian City in the Byzantine Age	193, 303
Notes on Christian History in Asia Minor	406
Dr. Sanday's Criticism of Recent Research	554
Rev. G. S. Streatfeild, M.A.	
The Apologetic Value of Criticism	112
Rev. G. R. Wynne, M.A.	
The Problem of the Epistles to the Thessalonians	364
Rev. Professor Theodor Zahn, Litt.D.	
Missionary Methods in the Times of the Apostles	456

INDEX OF TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Gen. vi. 3	249	Matt. xii. 2, 10	526	Mark ix. 13	241
x. 4	561	22-32	521	x. 12	359
xv. 6	51	30	523	39	236, 247
xix. 2	134	40	235	xiii. 3	247
Lev. xvi. 7-10	81	xiv. 28-32	235	xiv. 29	17
Num. vi. 24	149	xvi. 28	233	33	326
Deut. xviii. 10, 11	137	xviii. 6	185	xv. 6, 7	6
xxxiv. 7	249	20	71	xvi. 12-14	533
2 Sam. xvii. 16	134	xix. 1	268	17	252
2 Kings i. 12	245	21	360	Luke i. 15	551
1 Chron. iii. 24	501	xxii. 46	534	70	120
Ezra v. 3, 9	300	xxiii. 24	268	ii. 20	40
vi. 7	502	35	54	25	250
x. 6	493	xxiv. 14	546	iii. 18	545
Neh. i. 4, 5	483	xxviii. 10	7	iv. 16-21	519
xi. 32	486	19	43	18, 19	519
xii. 22	491	19	189	v. 1-11	7, 540
xiii. 28	491	Mark i. 4	545	ix. 32	246
Ps. i. 1	136	8	543	51-56	244
ix. 15	137	14	267	xi. 20	524
xxix. 3	47	16-20	247, 326	xiii. 9	189
Isa. ix. 1 ⁷	117	iii. 6	530	xvii. 28-32	249
xiv. 12	150	14	247	xxiv. 10	5
xxxiv. 14	143	17	244	25, 26	2
lvii. 2	150	20-35	521	25	185
Jer. xxvii. 9	137	21	333	27	257
Matt. iii. 11	543	23	522	John i. 31	547
ix. 3, 11	526	31-35	523	35-42	326
xi. 3	544	vi. 14	243	38	257
xi. 3	550	45-52	235	iii. 12	549
14	243	viii. 1-9	345	35	550
18	276	ix. 1	237	36	188

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
John iv. 6-9	57	Acts xiv. 12	452	Gal. ii. 9	247, 446
32	521	xvii. 2	367	20	339
v. 35	244	xix. 4	552	iii. 11	186
vi. 51	331	xx. 26	80	28	362
52-58	235	xxvi. 14	455	Eph. i. 23	19
viii. 44	62	Rom. i. 17	186	iv. 18	440
57	41	26	441	v. 22-33	361
ix. 7	257	iii. 22	186	Phil. i. 29	186
x. 42	551	25, 26	82	ii. 15	449
xi. 3, 11	325	v. 18	83	17	187
xii. 22	539	vi. 17	446	iii. 13	445
37-50	324	viii. 15	444	iv. 8	441
xiii. 1-30	329	22	452	12	448
36	234	ix. 4	444	2 Tim. ii. 4	446
xiv. 31	63	x. 4	120	iv. 5	467
xviii. 8	327	xv. 19	443	6	447
xix. 25	332	19, 23	459	6-8	460
37	67	26	447	16-18	460
xx. 15	8	xvi. 1	457	Heb. vii.	257
20	59	1 Cor. vii. 1	349	James i. 3	508
29	2	25-40	356	1 Pet. i. 7	508
xxi. 2	539	ix. 25	445	22, 23	85
18	247	x. 20-22	332	2 Pet. i. 14	540
20	327	xi. 3	363	17	538
23	237, 535	20	330	1 John i. 4	548
Acts i. 3	7	xii. 3	60	iv. 14	548
8	233	xiv. 7	258	v. 4	187
ii. 42	345	18	254	7	68
iii. 16	185	xv. 4	336	Rev. i. 9	251
21	120	5-8	2	ii. 8	472
x. 44-46	257	2 Cor. i. 19	463	xi. 1-13	245
xi. 3	553	x. 13	443	3-13	239
30	250	xi. 25	407	4	244
xii. 1	234	Gal. ii. 2	189	xiv. 4	336
xiv. 6	203	8	536	xix. 10	251

